

THE
ECLECTIC REVIEW

FOR OCTOBER, 1842.

Art. I. *The Divine Rule of Faith and Practice; or, A Defence of the Catholic Doctrine that Holy Scripture has been since the times of the Apostles the sole divine rule of faith and practice to the Church, against the dangerous errors of the Authors of the Tracts for the Times, and the Romanists, as, particularly, that the Rule of Faith is 'made up of Scripture and Tradition together,' &c.; in which also the doctrines of the Apostolical Succession, the Eucharistic Sacrifice, &c., are fully discussed.* By William Goode, M.A., of Trinity College, Cambridge, Rector of St. Antholin, London. 2 vols. London: J. Hatchard and Son.

HERE we have Protestant Cambridge against Popish Oxford, not, indeed, for the first time, and certainly, not out of due season; for this work affords a consoling proof that, while dissenters are defending the much abused Reformation, the sounder part of the establishment has not left us to sustain the battle alone. We are not aware of any defence of the great principles of protestantism from the quarter most interested in the present contest, that can equal the volumes before us; for Baptist Noel, Dr. Shuttleworth, and others, have but sent up rockets or squibs compared with the heavy ordnance of Mr. Goode. We fear, indeed, that he will scarcely be rewarded by all the attention to which he has a legitimate claim; for, though he has erred on the right side, by adducing against an obstinate party a redundancy of proofs and of reasons, the tracts of his opponents will, in a superficial age, have a decided advantage over two thick octavoes, which are in danger, like Mr. Scott's defence of Calvinism against Bishop Tomlin, of being crushed by their own weight. Both these works, with all their merits, have, by defending a particular church, secured a momentary

victory at the expense of permanent utility. Mr. Goode, however, defends a position of lasting importance, the authority and sufficiency of inspired Scripture; while the instances in which he departs from his own argument to espouse what we think an opposite cause, are but rare.

He dedicates his work to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London, whether, because he thought they needed it, we will not say; but if the laws of dedication require that they should read it, we are glad of his decision. That one who displays so much love for scriptural truth and pure religion should have undertaken this task was natural; and that he has entered into it *con amore*, is manifest; for he has unmasked the tractators with a vengeance. They proceeded at first with so much caution, that none but those who were practised theologians could foresee their course. The publication of Froude's remains, however, opened the eyes of even the less discerning part of the public. The new sect seems, indeed, to have been learning, even while it was teaching, and, emboldened by the mysterious silence of the prelates, it has gone, like another hero, farther than it intended. Its members have at length avowed that the articles of their own church are not necessarily to be interpreted by the known intentions of the framers; but may be taken in the *Catholic* sense,—that is to say, as they interpret the epithet, consistently with the decrees of the council of Trent. See Tract, No. 90:—‘To call the earlier reformers martyrs, is, according to this school, begging the question, which no one pretending to the name of catholic can, for a moment, think of conceding to them; and protestantism in its essence and all its bearings, is characteristically the religion of corrupt human nature.’

To ‘unprotestantize the national church, at any cost, is the object of their high ambition,’—that is to say (creating a verb as good as theirs), to poperize it; so that, ‘as we go on, we must recede more and more from the principles, if any such there be, of the English reformation.’

This is, therefore, a new sect of dissenters, who, preferring to eat other men's bread within a church which they condemn, leave to the elder sects the costly honesty of retiring to ‘eat their own bread.’

The reformers contended that they revived the ancient religion; but these new lights affirm that catholicism, not protestantism, was the ancient faith and practice. They mourn ‘their long and fatal separation,’ not from the foreign protestant churches which the reformers acknowledged as true, but ‘from the sister churches in other lands,’ meaning popish countries; and therefore think all methods lawful to make out an agreement

with them in the thirty-nine articles, known to be framed in opposition to them. If this attempt can succeed so far as to produce a reconciliation with Rome, the tone of the new sect will be altered, and, after a time, the articles too; for though the present aim is to show that they may be *endured*, we shall at length be told that this is a different thing from being approved or continued. For, even now, they tell us that 'very vital truths are concerned in the change they wish to effect in our church, many matters of life or death.'

To colour their continuance in the national communion, they profess to appeal to her divines, but are compelled to confine themselves to a small coterie of non-jurors, who became dissenters, but, destitute of the spirit of confessors, died away for want of state patronage and support.

In fact, the Puseyian appeals to witnesses from every quarter are most disingenuous, for they claim the fathers, just as Rome claims the Scriptures, in a mode that will satisfy none but those who are ignorant of what the Scriptures contain, or are so credulous as to take the bearings of each passage upon the credit of the quotation. A host of divines of the church of England, Mr. Goode has triumphantly defended against the deceptive Catenas of the tractators.

The early success of the *conspirators*, to use Mr. Froude's own phrase, is ascribed by Mr. Goode to the alarm created within the church by the attacks of the voluntaries on the principle of all national churches, which, if correct, is a proof of the wisdom and virtue of a bold movement in the cause of truth. For, as Mr. Goode will hardly suppose we have actually converted the tractators from protestants to papists, we must have merely made them honest; and if truth must have foes, let them be at least stripped of their masks. If Mr. Goode has been called to write two volumes against his clerical brethren, and to say of his own church, as the ancient Israelite of his dwelling, 'it seems to me there is as it were a plague in the house,' the sooner the plague spots are discovered the better, that we may apply the remedy ere it be too late. He cannot be surprised, if *we* first saw this popish tendency, and if we still see it where he as yet does not. Could we, then, think it less than a duty to attempt to rescue souls from the deadly influence which a state church enables false teachers to diffuse with tremendous force? And now that the secret has come out, so that Mr. Goode has published two volumes of confessions, must it not aggravate our sense of injustice, when commanded to contribute to the support of men who are labouring to destroy the truths most dear, not only to our hearts, but also to that of the man who blames our zeal?

In our author's hopes that 'the triumphing of the wicked will

be short,' we sympathize; but in what way the new error will be defeated and rendered subservient to the triumphs of truth, we pretend not to foresee. We have formerly hoped that state churches would expire by force of truth and grace; their members and ministers becoming so sensible of the spirituality of Christ's kingdom, and so powerfully diffusing their convictions downwards among the people, and upwards among the high places of government, that all would consent to render to Cæsar only those things that belong unto Cæsar, and leave to God what belongs exclusively to God. But late events have led us to suspect that the nuisance will be abated, in consequence of becoming intolerable; that the fruits of national churches will convince the world that the tree must be bad, and all will join to say, 'cut it down; why cumbereth it the ground?' The Puritan objection to our semi-reformation, that we had not gone far enough from Rome to prevent us from going back, has been proved true; and whether the Oxford party will lead the nation back, or whether they will themselves become a new body of dissenters, or like their favourite non-jurors, sink down and die in a lethargy, who can pretend to say?

Mr. Goode's refutation very properly seizes the following passage as containing the virus of the tracts:—

'They [i. e. popular Protestants] must either give up their maxim about the Bible, and the Bible only, or they must give up the Nicene formulary. *The Bible does not carry with it its own interpretation.* When pressed to say why they maintained fundamentals of faith, they will have no good reason to give, supposing they do not receive *the creed also as A FIRST PRINCIPLE.* Why, it is asked them, should those who equally with themselves believe in the Bible be denied the name of Christians, because they do not happen to discern the doctrine of the Trinity therein? If they answer that Scripture itself singles out certain doctrines as necessary to salvation, and that the Trinity is one of them, this, indeed, is *most true*, but *avails not* to persons committed to so untrue a theory. It is urged against them, that though the texts referred to *may imply the catholic doctrine, yet they need not*; that they *ARE CONSISTENT WITH ANY ONE OUT OF SEVERAL THEORIES; or at any rate that other persons think so*; that these others have as much right to their opinion as the party called orthodox to theirs; that human interpreters have no warrant to force upon them one view in particular; that private judgment must be left unmolested; that man must not close what God has left open; that Unitarians (as they are called) believe in a Trinity, only not in the catholic sense of it; and that, where men are willing to take and profess what is written, it is not for us to be 'wise above what is written,' especially when by such a course we break the bonds of peace and charity. *THIS REASONING, GRANTING THE FIRST STEP, IS RESISTLESS.*'—Vol. i., pp. 26, 27.

Now it is obvious, that whatever is said of the uncertainty of

Scripture and the necessity for some authorized interpreter, must lie equally against this boasted catholic tradition, so that we must have some other oracle to decide what is the meaning of the patristic response; and when we have obtained this second, we shall want a third to interpret the former, and thus we may go on *ad infinitum*. That we actually do need an interpreter of Mr. Newman's words will be clear to every man that examines them. The false positions of the members of his sentences might provoke one to say, 'Davus sum, non Œdipus.' Who can unriddle them? They have often awakened our suspicion that he did not intend to be understood. Did the apostles 'walk in craftiness, and handle the word of God deceitfully?' The Oxford tracts and the whole present controversy tend to this point, that the articles of the church of England so much need an interpreter, that their true meaning is but just beginning to be discovered. And might not similar ingenuity, employed upon the decrees of the council of Trent, make an equal display of their amphibologies?

That, however, some speak out plainly enough, the following sentence proves:—'Religious truths are partly the interpretation, and partly the supplement of Scripture.' May we not, then, expect, some day, from the Oxford press, a splendid edition of the *Supplement to the Scriptures*? But though this appears to us even more than clear enough, we question whether the silly sheep fed by these shepherds ever notice this portentous supplement. Alas! they need another oracle, to explain to them the responses of this new one; and when the defects of divine revelation have been thus supplied, they will need a supplement to the supplement.

They plead, that 'it is only by tradition that we have any safe and clear rule for changing the weekly feast from the seventh to the first day.' Now, in this very sentence there is nothing safe, nothing clear, though we must confess that we again suspect it was not intended to be clear. A weekly feast! Do they mean one of those village feasts which run round the year in the northern parts of the country? Perhaps not; for they are more likely to mean what they call the feast of Easter, or Epiphany. But who shall decide what they do mean? Every one will interpret according to his own idea of a feast. A coterie of London citizens will think of a turtle feast in their company's hall. But this mystification was intended to convey the anti-puritan idea of the day, and to sanction the popish practice of turning the Lord's day into the day for festive pleasures. It is a feast day, and therefore the book of sports was a good directory for its use.

Now, against all this clear and safe rule of the traditionist, we

will match the single phrase of Scripture, 'the Lord's day.' They will ask us, perhaps, how we know what that day was: we answer, 'just as we know what any other day means.' If they will tell us how they know the signification of $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$, or Ἰησοῦς , we will tell them the meaning of $\kappaυ\rho\iota\alpha\kappa\eta\eta$. The apostle evidently supposes that the seven churches to which he was commanded to write, knew the meaning of the word, and we know what day it designated, just as we know what is understood by Sunday in our vulgar heathenish dialect. This day, then, was to the disciples of Christ, while under the guidance of inspired apostles, their Lord's day. 'Well, and what of that,' say they who love to talk like deists against Scripture, and like monks about Candlemas day. We answer, with the apostle, 'much every way.' The ancient church knew that one day, being set apart for sacred rest and divine worship, was called by Jehovah, '*my holy day*;' and now the apostle calls the day of the Lord's resurrection the Lord's day, sacred to the Lord's service, as the Lord's supper is appropriated solely to the Lord's worship and honour. This is all 'clear to him that understandeth, and right to him that findeth knowledge,' for whom the Scriptures were especially intended; while to those who love to cavil, it is 'a snare and a trap.' Their own tradition will confute them at the last day, when it will be seen that their supplement was less clear than the book whose defects it was intended to supply.

Mr. Newman, affecting to differ from the Romanists, admits their rule of traditions, necessary to be added to Scripture, to supply its defects, but denies that the Romanist are the Catholic traditions. Now here are the great advocates of tradition at Rome, where, they say, is its authorized depository, contending that certain things are a part of that tradition, while another advocate for tradition (a private individual be it observed) admits the rule, and denies that those things are contained in it. Can this rule be clear? Can it be more clear than the Scriptures? If the question were, 'Are these things contained in the Scripture?' we could at once appeal to the book, and if the things were there, point to the chapter and verse. But as it is a question of tradition, whither shall we go? To Rome, says the Romanist. No, says Mr. Newman. Who shall decide between them? Mr. Newman assumes the right; but the Romanist exclaims, 'What! after denouncing private judgment, set up your own decision against that of Catholic tradition?' But it is no Catholic tradition, says Mr. Newman. It is, say they who claim to be catholic, *par eminence*. It taxes all our candour or charity, to suppose that one who astounds others by his astute discoveries of hidden meanings in articles and confessions, does not see the false position in which he is placed, and if the party

are not aiming to bring in universal scepticism, we can scarcely avoid suspecting they are under judicial infatuation.

They pretend that nothing but tradition, in their sense of it, informed even the earliest Christians that the Scriptures came from the apostles. But St. Paul declares that the salutations of his epistles were written with his own hand, that it might be known, 'so I write.' The first churches knew the apostle's letters, just as we know those of our friend. The Oxford party has even ventured to affirm that we know the inspiration of Scriptures, only by tradition; a plain proof that they have never read them with discerning and enlightened eyes.

Mr. Goode introduces one of the tractarians, affirming that tradition reveals to us truths not contained in Scripture, such as 'the paramount authority of the successors of the apostles,—Church government,—the threefold order established from the beginning,—the virtue of the blessed eucharist as a commemorative sacrifice,—infant baptism, and, above all, the doctrine of the blessed trinity as contained in the Nicene creed.'

We give him thanks for this admission, that the pretended apostolical succession is not contained in Scripture, nor the threefold order of ministers; and baptists will thank him for saying the same of infant baptism; but we entreat our readers to observe the grand reason for introducing tradition: it enables men to give authority to the great articles of Puseyism, confessedly not contained in Scripture. Men's practice makes their creed. 'Every plant that our heavenly Father hath not planted, shall, however, be rooted up, but the word of the Lord shall endure for ever.'

An infamous passage against the Scriptures, containing all the virus of popery, closes with the assertion, that 'you would have to work your way through heterogeneous materials, and after your best attempts, there would be much hopelessly obscure. Such, I conceive, with such limitations afterwards to be noticed, is the construction of the Bible.' But he who wrote this had subscribed an article, which says, 'The Scriptures contain all that is necessary to salvation;' and even as much as this could not have been known had they been hopelessly obscure.

Dr. Pusey is also quoted as saying, 'We reject the Romanist tradition, only on historical grounds; that, not being primitive, universal, and historical, but repugnant to Scripture, it is not to be received. Here private judgment is set up against a church far more extensive and ancient than that to which Dr. Pusey belongs, and traditions are rejected as contrary to Scripture, which is dissenting doctrine. Some traditions, however, are said to be *almost* infallible. Pray, good reader, what is that but fallible?'

'In the English church,' says Mr. Newman, 'we shall hardly

find ten or twenty neighbour clergymen who agree together ; and that, not in the non-essentials of religion, but as to what are its elementary and necessary doctrines ; or as to the fact, whether there are any necessary doctrines at all, any distinct and definite faith required for salvation.' Yet Dr. Hook would have us hear this church ! We must hear then, as at Babel ; where he that asked for bricks was supposed to mean mortar. This is exactly the description which the same party gives of dissenting differences, though we can go from the Land's End to Caithness, and preach in thousands of pulpits without exciting the least suspicion of differences ; whilst Mr. Newman would not be admitted into many a pulpit in his own church, and ' scarcely a score of clergymen can be found who agree in any doctrine.'

But the Jesuitry of the following passage is intolerable. 'The protestantism of the day considers it a hardship to have anything clearly and distinctly told it, in elucidation of Scripture doctrine, an infringement of its right of doubting, of mistaking, and of labouring in vain.' Could the writer have dictated this in good faith ? Did he not know that elucidations of Scripture are the staple of the most thoroughly protestant preaching ; and that, instead of being rejected as hardships, they are welcomed as useful aids. Is there any advantage in such a perversion of an oponent's sentiments, except to abuse the vulgar, where those who can see through the fallacy have not the opportunity to disabuse them ?

A piece of scepticism on the borders of Atheism is quoted by Mr. Goode.

'According to English [!] principles, faith has *all it needs* in knowing that God is our Creator and Preserver, and that he MAY, IF IT SO HAPPEN, have spoken. . . . *Doubt may even be said to be implied in a Christian's faith.*' (p. 103.) Nay, saith Mr. Keble, '*evidence complete in all its parts leaves no room for faith.*' (p. 82.) And to put an end to all doubt as to the doctrine they hold on this subject, Mr. Newman openly tells us, that '*to accept revelation at all*' '*we have but probability to show AT MOST, NAY, TO BELIEVE IN THE EXISTENCE OF AN INTELLIGENT CREATOR.*' (p. 69.)—*Ib.*, p. 78.

Mr. Newman openly tells us that to accept revelation at all, we have but probability to show at most, nay, to believe in the existence of an intelligent Creator. The apostle declared, however, that this is so clearly seen, that they are without excuse who do not glorify him as God. But Rome has long been charged with cherishing in her bosom many speculative atheists.

Against the apostolicity of what is called the apostles' creed, Mr. Goode is triumphant, chap. iv. He gives us also a passage which is as useful as surprising :—

'The confession of the Benedictine Editors of Ambrose on this subject is so remarkable and instructive, that I here subjoin it. 'It is not, indeed, surprising,' they say, 'that Ambrose should have written in this way concerning the state of souls; but it may appear almost incredible *how uncertain and inconsistent the holy Fathers, from the very times of the Apostles to the Pontificate of Gregory XI. and the Council of Florence*, that is, for almost the whole of fourteen centuries, were on this point. For not only does one differ from another, *as generally happens in questions of this kind before they are decided by the church*; but they are not even consistent with themselves; for in some places of their writings they seem to concede the clear vision of the Divine nature to the same souls to which in other places they deny it. But it is not to our purpose here to collect together those opposing testimonies of the ancient Fathers. Any one who wishes to know more on this matter may consult Alph. a Castro, (lib. 3, adv. hæc.), Sixtus Senensis, (Bibl. 1. 6. Annot. 345.), Bellarmine, (lib. 1. De Beat. c. 1, et seq.), Petavius (Theolog. dogm. de Deo, c. 13 and 14), and others. We here only observe, that all that contrariety sprung from the different ideas (*principiis*) which *the reading of the Holy Scriptures supplied to those holy men.*'—Ib., p. 298.

Laud is here introduced in a connexion that makes us exclaim, 'is Saul also among the prophets!'

'For, as their favourite Archbishop Laud will tell them, it is 'God's Spirit who *alone* works faith and belief of the Scriptures and their divine authority, as well as other articles;' our assent to this truth is 'by the operation of God's Spirit.' 'The credit of Scripture to be divine, resolves, finally, into that faith which we have touching God himself, and in the same order. For as that, so this hath three main grounds, to which all other are reducible. The first is, the tradition of the church; and this leads us to a reverend persuasion of it. The second is, the light of nature. . . . The third is, *the light of the text itself, in conversing wherewith we meet with the Spirit of God, inwardly inclining our hearts, and sealing the full assurance of the sufficiency of all three unto us. And then, and not before, we are certain, that the Scripture is the Word of God, both by divine, and by infallible proof;*' from which latter passage (and many similar and stronger occur in the context) we may see how far the Archbishop was from the sentiments of our opponents on the point which forms the subject of this chapter.'—Ib., p. 463.

For this we could almost forgive him anything but cutting off men's ears, and slitting their noses; though we own that he who did so, seems to utter, like Balaam, what he neither understood nor loved, but was compelled to deliver, by force of circumstances; for there was so much knowledge of theology in his time as to make such confessions necessary.

Mr. Goode, in his second volume, demonstrates the sufficiency

of Scripture to determine all those points for which the tractarians would introduce tradition. Here, however, we cannot say that we are satisfied; for, instead of keeping strictly to Scripture, he introduces the fathers to help them out, for which his opponents will treat him as Leviathan the darts of steel that he laughs at as mere straws.

We must say the same of his defence of the threefold order, bishops, priests, and deacons.

‘The threefold order of the priesthood; another point for which, according to our opponents, we are indebted to tradition.

‘To see the labours of our great divines who have pointed out the clear and plain authority we have in Scripture for the threefold order of our ministry thus dismissed as unavailing, for the mere purpose of bolstering up the cause of ‘tradition,’ is indeed melancholy. The very ground upon which our greatest theologians have rested the strength of their cause in this matter is thus abandoned, and the constitution of our ministry placed upon a foundation of sand.’—Vol. ii., p. 60.

Now the very priesthood itself is not merely extra-Scriptural, but anti-Scriptural. Almost half a hundred times are the words for priest and priesthood employed in the New Testament, and not once applied to Christian ministers, but always either to Pagan priests, or to the Jewish priests, or to Christ as the antitype of the latter; or, what is still worse for Mr. Goode, if these terms are applied to Christians at all, it is to the whole body of the faithful, who are told ‘ye are a royal priesthood.’ The only instance in which the word *κλήρο* is introduced, applies it to the people in distinction from the ministers, who are charged ‘not to lord it over God’s clergy.’

The manner in which Mr. Goode has evaded the question of deacons is not creditable to him; for, in fact, the party which he opposes has here surpassed him in perspicuity, or honesty; for the Puseyite Christian Remembrancer, in its review of Dr. Bennett’s *Theology of the Early Christian Church*, has virtually conceded the point for which he contends,—that neither the Scriptures, nor the primitive fathers, view deacons as ministers of the word.

Mr. Goode first finds his three distinct orders, in the apostles, and elders, (presbyters) and deacons; but, as we have now no apostles, there remain but two orders; and, as deacons are not ministers of the word, there is but one. It is really pitiable to see a well-meaning man reduced, by his position, to such shifts as he employs. He admits that the pastors are called indifferently presbyters, or bishops, but contends that the name is nothing, the thing is what we must inquire for; and then, to make bishops, apostles, he pleads the application of the latter name

beyond the twelve, though it is manifest that here the name is even of less force than in the former case, where he declared it signified nothing; for all acknowledge that of apostles there were, properly speaking, but twelve.

'We may observe, therefore, that in this Epistle to the Philippians, we have another remarkable testimony to the position that the clergy then consisted of three orders, corresponding to those which have been received in all episcopal churches. For this epistle is addressed by the apostle to the saints at Philippi, '*with the bishops and deacons,*' (Phil. i. 1) which shows that these were the only orders of ministers then present at Philippi; to whom, however, we are to add Epaphroditus, *their apostle*, who was then with St. Paul, having been sent to him by the church at Philippi (Phil. iv. 18), and who returned to Philippi with St. Paul's letter, (ii. 25, et seq. &c.) In the Book of Revelation we find them spoken of (as we shall see presently) under the name of the *angel* of the church over which they presided, a name very similar in meaning to that of apostle; and in the writings immediately succeeding the apostolical times, we find such persons known by the name of *bishops* of the churches.'—Ib., p. 64.

Was there ever a more gross failure than this attempt to prove three orders of ecclesiastics? For if this introduction of the passage concerning Epaphroditus can prove anything, it must be that there was an apostle in the church of Philippi, besides the bishops and deacons, and then we shall have four orders; apostles, bishops, presbyters, deacons. That the Scriptural doctrine is also the catholic, may be proved by the fathers, and has been admitted by divines of all communions:—that the deacons were not ministers of the word, but administrators of the church's possessions; and that presbyters and bishops are the same; for, if any difference is made, it is by appropriating the latter name to that one presbyter, who, among many, presided as the senior or president. This we could fearlessly maintain against all the world.

It gives us more pleasure to notice Mr. Goode's truly catholic plea for other ordination than that which prevails in his own church; for he says, 'I would advise our opponents to take heed how they make the observance of such ecclesiastical ordinances essential; for they will thus leave no succession in existence in the present day.' These are testimonies which seem to show, not merely that it was not absolutely essential, but that it was not universally practised.

'For instance, the testimony of Eutychius of Alexandria is plain that such was not the case originally at Alexandria. His words are these. After mentioning that Mark the Evangelist went and preached at Alexandria, and appointed Hananias the first patriarch there, he adds, 'Moreover, he appointed twelve presbyters with Hananias, who

were to remain with the patriarch, so that when the patriarchate was vacant, they might elect one of the twelve presbyters, upon whose head the other eleven might place their hands and bless him [or, invoke a blessing upon him], and create him patriarch, and then choose some excellent man and appoint him presbyter with themselves in the place of him who was thus made patriarch, that thus there might always be twelve. Nor did this custom respecting the presbyters,—namely, that they should create their patriarchs from the twelve presbyters, cease at Alexandria until the times of Alexander, Patriarch of Alexandria, who was of the number of the 318, [bishops at Nice.] But he forbade the presbyters to create the patriarch for the future, and decreed that when the patriarch was dead, the bishops should meet together and ordain the patriarch. Moreover, he decreed that on a vacancy of the patriarchate, they should elect, either from any part of the country, or from those twelve presbyters, or others, as circumstances might prescribe, some excellent man and create him patriarch. And thus that ancient custom by which the patriarch used to be created by the presbyters disappeared, and in its place succeeded the ordinance for the creation of the patriarch by the bishops.’—*Ib.*, pp. 80, 81.

Here the presbyters laid their hands on a man and created him a bishop. Mr. Goode, charitably wishing to allow the validity of ordination by presbyters, proves that this was done in the very earliest times, and we ask no more. For though he ventures not to plead for any but the foreign reformed churches, we think that what is good theology at Geneva, or Amsterdam, is not heresy in London or Oxford. As to all he says about creating schisms in *our* church, a national church is not *our* church, and we should do something like creating a schism in what *is* our church, by quitting that in which we have found Christ.

‘For the Archbishop of St. Andrews, in his History of Scotland, tells us, ‘that when the Scots bishops were to be consecrated by the Bishops of London, Ely, and Bath, here at London house, anno 1609, a question was moved by Dr. Andrews, Bishop of Ely, touching the consecration of the Scottish bishops, who, as he said, must first be ordained presbyters as having received no ordination from a bishop. The Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Bancroft, who was by, maintained ‘that thereof there was no necessity, seeing *where bishops could not be had, the ordination given by the presbyters must be esteemed lawful*, otherwise that it might be doubted if there were any lawful vocation in most of the reformed churches.’ This applauded to by the other bishops, Ely acquiesced.’ And this testimony is the more remarkable from Dr. Bancroft, as in his famous sermon at Paul’s Cross, he was considered to have taken rather high ground as to the claims of episcopacy.’—*Ib.*, p. 96.

Of Mr. Goode’s tenth and eleventh chapters we shall say nothing; for, though they are excellent, they merely prove what all protes-

tants admit, that the Scriptures are sufficient to teach mankind the Christian religion. The testimony of the fathers to the same point, which Dr. Bennett has traced to the end of the third century, Mr. Goode brings down to the age of Gregory, in 590. Our theological readers might naturally ask, why stop there? What is there in the sixth century to exalt it above the seventh? Were there no fathers later than Gregory? Most will say, 'yes, as late as Bernard.' But, again it is asked, why stop there? We may as well fix our ultima thule in the sixth, as the eleventh century; and as well go on beyond the latter as the former. No rule can be framed for the definition of a father, except that of Augustin, that 'the apostles were the only fathers, and all others are but sons;' and, alas, some of them rebellious apostates, 'children that are corruptors.'

To one quotation, however, we should have been glad, if our space would have allowed us, to refer our readers, for it affects councils as well as fathers. Mr. Goode triumphantly shows that Oxford has abjured the doctrine of the church of England, and thus he closes:—

'Am I, then, speaking too strongly when I say that the tractators, instead of boasting any longer of the support to be found for their system in the works of our most learned and able divines, are bound to explain how it is that they have been so far misled as ever to make such a claim? I am far from asserting that there has been any *intentional* misrepresentation of the views of those quoted; much allowance is to be made for a prejudiced eye and imperfect information; but that they have been misrepresented is, I suppose, placed beyond contradiction, by the extracts which have just been given. In whatever way, then, we may be enabled to account for it, certain it is that *truth has been sacrificed*, and the authority of great names pleaded in behalf of a system in no respect entitled to such protection. Nor is it possible to acquit those who had *the means of information* open to them, of culpable neglect in not ascertaining the real state of the case, in a matter of such importance, before they made use of the names of our most learned and esteemed divines as supporters of doctrines which they have expressly repudiated.'—*Ib.*, pp. 801, 802.

He has clearly proved his point for the moderate protestant section of the church of England, and thus, for the dissenters also. For we would put it to any lawyer accustomed to sift evidence, and bring out satisfactory conclusions that may be trusted to the verdict of an honest jury, whether these comprehensive volumes do not demonstrate that the dissenters have the Scriptures and the fathers in their favour. The question of a national church is not touched; and neither the Scriptures nor the earliest fathers will be adduced in support of this novelty of the fourth century.

We wish we could predict for Mr. Goode the reward that

he deserves for labours which must have been immense; but this would be what he himself would decline, that is, to learn from us 'a more excellent way.' For as truly as Puseyism ends in popery, thorough anti-Puseyism must terminate in dissent. There are but these two classes of church principles, and Erastianism, which pretends to no principles at all, but leaves everything to expedience. Mr. Sibthorp has honestly followed out one set of principles, and gone to Rome; and an archbishop has defended Erastianism, with all the force of his logical mind. Whether the Church of England is more popish or more Erastian, is not easily determined; for two parties have struggled in her for the victory, while the kings who were her real creators, have cared for nothing but their own interests. The Erastianism of Hooker is shown by Mr. Goode in p. 69; but other communions have too much of the same evil leaven. The tractarians say, 'it is the religion of corrupt human nature, which loves to make a religion for itself, rather than take that which God has made for us.' But here lies the difference, that voluntary churches keep themselves at liberty to take whatever they may find that God has given, and state churches must take what the state has given. Our Scotch brethren are learning this to their sorrow. But, as extremes meet, Puseyism has its Erastianism. Why does it shun the church of the first three centuries? Because the church was then voluntary, and could take what God has given. Why are later and more corrupt ages its favourites? Because the church was then 'in bondage to the elements of the world,' dictated to by the gods below, and, like other slaves, degraded enough to hug its chains.

The pure apostolic rule, to be found nowhere but in the New Testament, was thought not to work well; and, to improve upon God's plans, corrupt nature, which likes a religion of its own making, introduced a 'Diotrephes who loveth to have the pre-eminence.' But alas, the change has been found to work infinitely worse; and there is no remedy, but to go back to the religion of God's making. Where shall we find it, but in his own word? Readily confessing that this system, constructed for religious men, will never work well in the hands of those who are of an opposite character; we leave those who wish, to make the most of that confession. To accommodate the religion of Jesus to the world, is to suit logic to idiots, or music to the deaf. In fact, the church of the world has virtually conceded this point to the church of Christ, that a real church must be a society of regenerated persons. 'We will regenerate them, then,' the tractarians say. 'It is true, we cannot effect it by the word, as some profess to do, upon the ancient Scriptural plan; but then, we can pronounce this *antiquated*, and say that 'the sacraments, not

preaching, are the sources of divine grace.' It is equally true, that our regenerate persons are not discernable from their unregenerate; but, then, among ourselves, this is not known, or if known, not regarded.'

The new party that is striving for pre-eminence confesses, however, its Erastianism, when it avows that its episcopacy cannot be maintained on the principles of Chillingworth,—The Bible alone is the religion of protestants. What these persons call church principles, therefore, are nothing but Erastian tenets, without their honesty. They confess their church principles are not to be proved from Scripture, and Erastus says, no others are. But in cashiering the honesty, they lose the charm of his system; for, honestly carried out, it would bring us back to the Scriptures; since we shall never find any practices more expedient than those which are enjoined.

We are not without our hopes, that even the dishonest Puseyite-Erastianism, may be overruled to restore the Scriptural system which the party would undermine; for we have observed in one of their periodicals for January, a proposal for immensely multiplying the number of bishops, diminishing, of course, the extent of dioceses, and carrying visitations to such lengths that it would be difficult to discern the difference between this system and the Scriptural order of a bishop for every church. So extremes meet; and so little do men see whither their courses lead; while God 'worketh all things after the counsel of his own will.'

We have been so occupied with the great question as to be little inclined to minute criticism; but we were surprised to see the Greek quotations here without accents; and to find so many proofs of carelessness of style. Yet we thank Mr. Goode for what is better than correct composition and classical minutiae; a well intentioned and laboriously executed defence of Scriptural truth and catholic charity, which he has carried to the utmost lengths that his position could admit. Happy should we be if we could promise him a candid hearing from the men of his own church, or any hearing at all from the party against which he contends. But, if this is hopeless, Mr. Goode may comfort himself with the thought that he is but sharing with Whately in the haughty or crafty neglect with which that party treats all those who write against them what is best worth reading. Here, as in most other points, the Oxford men resemble those of Rome, ever crying, 'Hear the church,' but deeming it beneath the church to hear any one else. This is, indeed, quite in harmony with a claim to infallibility; but Rome concludes that her claim is established, while at Oxford this is yet to be done.

Hæ nugæ seria ducunt, and we look with sad anticipations to our country, which is identifying herself with the Beast, and

putting in her claim to share in its plagues. The elements of strife and confusion are at work; the many, sacrificed to the few, are in motion, under rash guides, indeed, we confess; but the more portentous are the signs of the times, and the more certainly we may predict that the Lord's controversy with the land will end in paying a long arrear of vengeance for sacrificing things sacred to secular designs, immortal souls to pampered bodies; and in driving out the buyers and sellers from the temple with a whip *not* of small cords.

Meanwhile, we wait and work, with the Bible and its inspiring spirit; assured, that to abide by these, in the worst times, is to win the noblest conquest, and secure the richest reward. The witnesses may be slain, but they will rise again; their dead bodies may lie unburied in the streets of the great city, but they will ascend up into heaven in the sight of all men; while the beast and the false prophet that deceived the nations, will be taken alive and cast into the lake of fire.

Art. II. *History of the Planting and Training of the Christian Church by the Apostles.* By Dr. Augustus Neander, Ordinary Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin, Consistorial Counsellor, &c. Translated from the Third Edition of the Original German, by J. E. Ryland. 2 vols. Edinburgh: Thomas Clark. 1842.

WE entirely agree with the remarks put forth in the translator's preface to these volumes, that 'the author's great and long established reputation as an ecclesiastical historian, would render it unnecessary, even if not somewhat unseemly, to usher in the work with a lengthened descant on its merits. The impartial and earnest inquirer after truth will not fail to be delighted with the marks it everywhere presents of unwearied research, extended views, and profound piety. No one would regret more than the excellent author, if the freedom of his inquiries should give pain to any of his Christian brethren.' These statements are true: the object of the present notice, therefore, will be, not to bespeak the public interest in its favour as a work, excellent in design and execution, yet likely from some cause or other to be overlooked, but rather to describe its character; to point out to whom it may be useful; and, if among the inquiries into which Dr. Neander has entered, there be any so free as to be likely to give pain to Christian minds, (or, what is of far greater consequence, to lead them astray, for pain is not necessarily injurious) then, and especially, to discuss those questions, or at least to in-

dicate, as our limits may allow, where, and in what respect, a more active caution appears necessary in perusing it.

The chief value of the work, which, on some accounts, might be regarded as the most important which its distinguished author has written, lies in its constituting an historico-critical introduction to the latter half of the New Testament. It is not enough to say, that the materials of it are almost exclusively derived from the book of Acts, and the inspired epistles; these are hardly more its sources than its subject. And the great distinction of these volumes, from the multitude of others which embrace the same subject, consists partly in the direction which the author's mind has taken in illustrating it; partly in the mass of literary information which he has brought to bear upon it; partly in the masterly experience with which the illustration is conducted; and partly in the Christian spirit which informs the whole.

We have characterized the work as historico-critical. It is such, not merely because it narrates the principal facts of primitive Christian history, and follows up this narrative with an elaborate analysis of apostolic doctrine, but because, being throughout historical in its subject, it is throughout critical in its manner. The doctrinal analysis is given to show historically, what, and how the apostles taught, not apologetically to justify their teaching; and the narrative of facts is everywhere invested with that light which criticism concentrates from a comprehensive knowledge of antiquity, and a successful perusal of human nature.

In six books the author exhibits—

‘I. The Christian church in Palestine, previous to its spread among heathen nations;’ (vol. i., pp. 1—65.)

‘II. The first spread of Christianity from the church at Jerusalem to other parts, and especially among heathen nations;’ (pp. 66—88.)

‘III. The spread of Christianity and founding of the Christian church among the Gentiles by the instrumentality of the Apostle Paul;’ (pp. 89—408.)

‘IV. A review of the labours of James and Peter during this period;’ (vol. ii., pp. 1—41.)

‘V. The apostle John and his ministry as the closing point of the apostolic age;’ (pp. 42—76.)

‘VI. The apostolic doctrine;’ (pp. 77—272.)

The general relation of the different parts of the work to each other, and their mutual proportions, may be sufficiently conceived from the preceding extract. Not so, however, the peculiar character of the analysis in the sixth book, in which the author submits successively to separate discussion:—1st, The Pauline doc-

trine (vol. ii., pp. 79—211); 2ndly, The doctrine of the Epistle to the Hebrews (pp. 212—228); 3rdly, The doctrine of James (pp. 229—239); and 4thly, The doctrine of John (pp. 239—271.) This separate analysis is very useful, as furnishing, in the only unexceptionable manner, the materials for a correct judgment respecting the harmony of New Testament doctrines as a whole. We shall presently take a cursory view of it in that respect. An adequate consideration of the doctrinal portion of the work would indeed very much exceed the limits to which we must confine ourselves, but some account of it is absolutely necessary to enable the general reader, or even the student by profession, duly to appreciate and use the materials here furnished to him. The reader will have observed, that the doctrine of Paul, and that of the Epistle to the Hebrews, are here distinguished from each other. This is a result of the opinion so prevalent in Germany, that Paul was not the author of that epistle, an opinion which we shall here pass by, as we have reserved it for more particular consideration at an early period.

It may surprise our readers, after what we have already said in general commendation of this work, to be told that there is perhaps hardly one representation of connected facts in it, with which we should circumstantially agree. We do not, however, say that this lessens its value to the class of readers for whom it was written, and to whose use it is exclusively adapted. It is a work expressly intended to aid the diligent, well instructed, earnest student of Christianity and of the word of God, in entering into the very spirit of the Christian life and doctrine. To such persons the excellent Neander has ever been a friend. To their benefit he may be truly said to have devoted his distinguished abilities, his precious time, and his warmest affections. But he would not be their master. What he teaches, he teaches with a deep consciousness of human liability to error; and if his works were studied with the spirit in which they are written, we should not fear the result. We do fear that there are in this country many careless readers, whose consciences have too little to do with their studies to make them diligent, and who are liable to be carried away, by ignorantly adopting views which have the sanction of Neander's illustrious name, to moral habits and conclusions very different from his; and still more that there are numerous enemies to Christianity who will use that name as a shield for speculative infidelity. But the blame in such cases is not his. He is no infidel, but on the contrary, a serious, warm-hearted, practical believer in Christ Jesus and the Christian revelation, who in the spirit of a living faith communicates the deep results of study and reflection, as a material for study and reflection to men of kindred mind. Writing in a land where

infidelity has by turns assumed every garb, and having his mind constantly exercised with systems of philosophy of the most contradictory and uncertain character, it is neither surprising that his phraseology should, even on biblical subjects, have sometimes a very unbiblical tincture, nor even that the results to which he has come should at times betray the power of principles very different to his own. These will, of course, with the *prestige* of his reputation, be deeply mischievous to the thoughtless sciolist, and still more so to the student, whose heart and conscience are not right with God. But to those in whom Christian humility is found in combination with soundness of judgment, the love of truth, and prayerful diligence and constancy in the pursuit of it, we do not hesitate, notwithstanding the blemishes which abound in the work, for these in our apprehension are certainly *very* numerous, to recommend it as a study adapted at once to test, to strengthen, and to inform their minds.

Having thus freely expressed our judgment on the work, it is imperative that we should justify it. It will interest our readers, and be grateful to our own feelings to present, in the first instance, some extracts of a favourable character. The extract which immediately follows exhibits that peculiar acquaintance with the interior of the Christian life by which all the historical writings of Dr. Neander are so remarkably distinguished. It relates to the youth of the Apostle Paul, and the object of it is to show how admirably he was prepared, both by temperament and education, for the great work which he was appointed to do.

‘ In this manner Christianity, independently of Judaism, began to be propagated among the Gentiles: the appointment of the gospel as a distinct means of forming *all nations* for the kingdom of God, was now acknowledged by the apostles; and consequently, on their part, no opposition could be made to employing it for this purpose. While by the arrangements of the divine wisdom, the principal obstacle to the conversion of the heathen was taken out of the way, and the first impulse was given to that work; by the same wisdom, that great champion of the faith who was to carry it on, and lay the foundation for the salvation of the heathen through all ages, was called forth, to take the position assigned him in the development of the kingdom of God. This was no other than the apostle Paul; a man distinguished, not only for the wide extent of his apostolic labours, but for his development of the fundamental truths of the gospel in their living organic connexion, and their formation into a compact system. The essence of the gospel in relation to human nature, on one side especially—the relation, namely, to its need of redemption—was set by him in the clearest light; so that when the sense of that need has been long repressed or perverted, and a revival of Christian consciousness has followed a state of spiritual death, the newly awakened Christian life,

whether in the church at large or in individuals, has always drawn its nourishment from *his* writings. As he has presented Christianity under this aspect especially, and has so impressively shewn the immediate relation of religious knowledge and experience to the Lord Jesus, in opposition to all dependence on any human mediation whatever—thus drawing the line of demarcation most clearly between the Christian and Jewish standing point—he may be considered as the representative among the apostles of the protestant principle.* And history, though it furnishes only a few hints respecting the early life of Paul before his call to the apostleship, has recorded enough to make it evident, that by the whole course of his previous development, he was formed for what he was to become, and for what he was to effect.

‘Saul or Paul, the former the original Hebrew, the latter the Hellenistic form of his name, was a native of the city of Tarsus in Cilicia. . . . As we do not know how long he remained under the paternal roof it is impossible to determine what influence his education in the metropolis of Cilicia, which, as a seat of literature, vied with Athens and Alexandria, had on the formation of his character. Certainly his early acquaintance with the language and national peculiarities of the Greeks was of some advantage in preparing him to be a teacher of Christianity among nations of Grecian origin. Yet the few passages from the Greek poets which we meet with in his discourse at Athens, and in his epistles, do not prove that his education had made him familiar with Grecian literature; nor is it probable that such would be the case. As his parents designed him to be a teacher of the law, or Jewish theologian, his studies must have been confined in his early years to the Old Testament, and about the age of twelve or thirteen he must have entered the school of Gamaliel. It is possible, though, considering Paul’s pharisaic zeal, not probable, that the more liberal views of his tolerant-minded teacher, Gamaliel, might induce him to turn his attention to Grecian literature. A man of his mental energy, whose zeal overcame all difficulties in his career, and whose love prompted him to make himself familiar with all the mental habitudes of the men among whom he laboured, that he might sympathize more completely with their wants and infirmities, might be induced, while among people of Grecian culture, to acquire some knowledge of their principal writers. But in the style of his representations, the Jewish element evidently predominates. His peculiar mode of argumentation was not formed in the Grecian, but the Jewish school. The name Saul, ~~hug~~, the desired one, the one prayed for, perhaps indicates that he was the first-born of his parents, granted in answer to their earnest prayers; and hence it may be inferred that he was devoted by his father, a Pharisee, to the service of religion, and sent in early youth to Jerusalem, that he might be trained

* This language is not unfairly open to the inference that ‘among the apostles’ there might also be a ‘representative’ of the popish principle. This, however, as a succeeding extract will show, is foreign to the author’s meaning. We must at the same time admit that he is too unguarded in his language here, and that, in this character of Paul, he writes too much like one forgetful that the apostle was, after all, an instrument, rather than an agent, in the development of Christian doctrine.

to become a learned expounder of the law and of tradition; not to add that it was usual for the youth of Tarsus to complete their education at some foreign school. Most advantageously for him, he acquired, in the pharisaic schools at Jerusalem, that systematic form of intellect which afterwards rendered him such good service in developing the contents of the Christian doctrine; so that, like Luther, he became thoroughly conversant with the theological system, which afterwards, by the power of the gospel, he uprooted and destroyed. A youth so ardent and energetic as Paul, would throw his own soul into whatever he undertook; his natural temperament would dispose him to an overflowing impetuous zeal, and for such a propensity Pharisaism supplied abundant aliment. We may also infer from his peculiar disposition, as well as from various hints he gives of himself, that in legal piety, according to the notions of the strictest Pharisaism, he strove to go beyond all his companions. But in proportion to the earnestness of his striving after holiness, the more he combated the refractory impulses of an ardent and powerful nature, which refused to be held in by the reins of the law, so much more ample were his opportunities for understanding, from his own experience, the woeful discord in human nature, which arises when the moral consciousness asserts its claims as a controlling law, while the man feels himself constantly carried away in defiance of his better longing and willing, by the force of ungodly inclination. Paul could not have depicted this condition so strikingly and to the life, in the seventh chapter of the epistle to the Romans, if he had not gained the knowledge of it from personal experience. It was advantageous for him that he passed over to Christianity, from a position where, by various artificial restraints and prohibitions, he had attempted to guard against the incursions of unlawful desires and passions, and to compel himself to goodness; for thus he was enabled to testify from his own experience, in which he appears as the representative of all men of deep moral feeling, how deeply the sense of the need of redemption is grounded in the moral constitution of man; and thus likewise, from personal experience, he could describe the relation of that inward freedom which results from faith in redemption to the servitude of the legal standing point. In his conflict with himself, while a pharisee, Paul's experience resembles Luther's in the cloisters of Erfurt.—Vol. i. pp. 89—94.

Dr. Neander afterwards enters into a full discussion of the circumstances attending the apostle's conversion, in the course of which, he takes occasion to refute the perverse construction put by Dr. Frederick Strauss, in his '*Leben Jesu*,' on the statement of his first edition, to the effect that he denied the reality of our Lord's appearance to Paul; but this would be too long for our pages. We will, however, select from another part of the work a passage, which if not much shorter, will have at least the recommendation of interesting the reader more, while it illustrates the author's general manner when he is not compelled to enter into minute and extended discussion.

‘ . . . Accompanied by some believers from Berea, he then directed his course to Athens.

‘ Though the consequences which resulted from the apostle’s labours at Athens were at first inconsiderable, yet his appearance in this city (which, in a different sense from Rome, might be called the metropolis of the world) was, in real importance, unquestionably one of the most memorable signs of the new spiritual creation. A herald of that divine doctrine, which, fraught with divine power, was destined to change the principles and practices of the ancient world, Paul came to Athens, the parent of Grecian culture and philosophy; the city to which, as the Grecian element had imbued the culture of the west, the whole Roman world was indebted for its mental advancement, which also was the central point of the Grecian religion, where an enthusiastic attachment to all that belonged to ancient Hellas, not excepting its idolatry, retained a firm hold till the fourth century. Zeal for the honours of the gods, each one of whom had here his temple and his altars, and were celebrated by the master-pieces of art, rendered Athens famous throughout the civilized world. It was at first Paul’s intention to wait for the arrival of Silas and Timothy before he entered on the publication of the gospel, as by his companions who had returned to Berea, he had sent word for them to follow him as soon as possible. But when he saw himself surrounded by the statues and altars, and temples of the gods, and works of art, by which the honour due to the living God alone was transferred to creatures of the imagination, he could not withstand the impulse of holy zeal, to testify of Him who called erring men to repentance, and offered them salvation. He spoke in the synagogue to the Jews and Proselytes, but did not wait, as in other cities, till a way was opened by their means of publishing the gospel to the heathen. From ancient times it was customary at Athens for people to meet together under covered porticoes in public places, to converse with one another on matters of all kinds, trifling or important; and then, as in the times of Demosthenes, groups of persons might be met with in the market collected together merely to hear of something new. Accordingly Paul made it his business to enter into conversation with the passers by, in hopes of turning their attention to the most important concerns of man. The sentiments with which he was inspired had nothing in common with the enthusiasm of the fanatic, who is unable to transport himself from his own peculiar state of feeling to the standing point of others, in order to make himself acquainted with the obstacles that oppose their reception of what he holds as truth with absolute certainty. Paul knew, indeed, as he himself says, that the preaching of the crucified Saviour must appear to the wise men of the world as foolishness, until they became fools, that is, until they were convinced of the insufficiency of their wisdom, in reference to the knowledge of divine things, and for the satisfaction of their religious wants, 1 Cor. i. 23, iii. 18. But he was not ashamed, as he also affirms, to testify to the wise and to the unwise, to the Greeks and to the barbarians, of what he knew from his own experience to be the power of God to save those that believe; Rom. i. 16.

The market to which he resorted was near a portico of the philosophers. Here he met with philosophers of the Epicurean and Stoic schools. If we reflect upon the relative position of the Stoics to the Epicureans, that the *former* acknowledged something divine as the animating principle in the universe and in human nature, that they were inspired with an ideal model founded in the moral nature of man, and that they recognised man's religious wants and the traditions which bore testimony to it; while on the other hand, the *latter*, though they did not absolutely do away with the belief in the gods, reduced it to something inert, unessential and superfluous; that they represented pleasure as the highest aim of human pursuit, and that they were accustomed to ridicule the existing religions as the offspring of human weakness and the spectral creations of fear; we might, from such a contrast, infer that the Stoics made a much nearer approach to Christianity than the Epicureans. But it does not follow that the former would give a more favourable reception to the gospel than the latter, for their vain notion of moral self-sufficiency was diametrically opposed to a doctrine which inculcated repentance, forgiveness of sins, grace, and justification by faith. This supreme God—the impersonal, eternal reason pervading the universe—was something very different from the living God, the heavenly Father, full of love, whom the gospel reveals, and who must have appeared to the Stoics as far too human a being; and both parties agreed in the Grecian pride of philosophy, which would look down on a doctrine appearing in a Jewish garb, and not developed in a philosophic form, as a mere outlandish superstition. Yet many among those who gathered round the apostle during his conversations, were at least pleased to hear something new; and their curiosity was excited to hear of the strange divinity whom he wished to introduce, and to be informed respecting his new doctrine. They took him to the hill, where the first tribunal at Athens, the Areopagus, was accustomed to hold its sittings, and where he could easily find a spot suited to a large audience. The discourse of Paul, on this occasion, is an admirable specimen of his apostolic wisdom and eloquence. We here perceive how the apostle (to use his own language) to the heathens became a heathen, that he might gain the heathens to Christianity.

‘Inspired by feelings that were implanted from his youth in the mind of a pious Jew, and glowing with zeal for the honour of his God, Paul must have been horror-struck at the spectacle of idolatry that met him wherever he turned his eyes. He might easily have been betrayed by his feelings into intemperate language. And it evinced no ordinary self-denial and self-command that, instead of beginning with expressions of detestation, instead of representing the whole religious system of the Greeks as a Satanic delusion, he appealed to the truth which lay at its basis, while he sought to awaken in his hearers the consciousness of God, which was oppressed by the power of sin, and thus aimed at leading them to the knowledge of that Saviour whom he came to announce. As among the Jews, in whom the knowledge of God, formed by divine revelation, led to a clear and full development of the idea of the Messiah, he would appeal to the national history, the

law and the prophets, as witnesses of Christ; so here he appealed to the undeniable anxiety of natural religion after an unknown God. He began with acknowledging, in the religious zeal of the Athenians, a true religious feeling, though erroneously directed; an undeniable tending of the mind towards something divine. He begins with acknowledging, in a laudatory manner, the strength of the religious sentiment among the Athenians, and adducing, as a proof of it, that while walking amongst their sacred edifices, he lighted on an altar dedicated to an unknown God.'—Ib., pp. 217—222.

It is a disadvantage that the length to which most of the discussions in this work extend, prevents our giving any specimens of them; for though it is in them that the chief blemishes of the work appear, they furnish many very profound and valuable results, especially those of them which relate to New Testament chronology. The attention paid to every particular which can by possibility throw light upon the date of the inspired epistles, is in the highest degree satisfactory; neither is any usage, fact, or circumstance disregarded, by which the obscurest allusion found in any of them may be explained. The knowledge of other men's studies which this work evinces, and the diligence with which that knowledge is turned to account, are truly German. If saying this be saying what, in relation to Dr. Neander, no one needs to be informed of, we must be allowed to observe that we could not, after the cautionary language we have been compelled to use, pass by these transcendent merits of the work in absolute silence.

But we are bound to characterize those features of the work, which are liable to mislead persons who rely too much on Dr. Neander's great authority. The chief of these are the love of paradox, under the guise of originality; the habit of supplementing the inspired history with *facts* and circumstances, resting upon the most meagre, or most uncertain basis, or both; and that of lowering, by unauthorized philosophizing explanations, the impressions of divine supernatural agency which the unfettered reading of the sacred books produces. We have sufficiently declared our assurance that these faults are not with Dr. Neander the offspring of an infidel spirit; but *they are* the effect of the infidel *malaria* with which the atmosphere he breathes is so strongly impregnated, and by which not one in a hundred of Germany's great theologians is altogether unaffected. We indicate them, therefore, not to detract from his acknowledged excellence, or diminish the impression of the important services which he has rendered to the student of Scripture and of Christian history (services for which we have ourselves deep reason to be grateful), but to defend, from what we consider an abuse, the great protestant principle of scrutinizing for ourselves the word

of God; to preserve our youth, and especially the students in our theological seminaries, the future pastors of our churches, from that *ultraism* in interpretation, (the effect, not of reason, but of rationalism,) which has so debased the theology of Germany; and to save, for so at least we regard it, the labours of a man, entitled on more accounts than we can here specify, to admiration and affection, from becoming, when reproduced on a new scene, the means of lowering the power and impression of that truth wherein God has caused him to hope.

The first instance we shall notice relates to the gift of tongues on the day of Pentecost. From the expression in Acts ii. 4, they 'began to speak with other tongues' (ἐτέραις γλώσσαις), and the declaration, v. 11, 'we do hear them speak in our tongues,' &c., as made by foreign Jews from all countries, it has for centuries been generally understood that this gift was that of speaking by inspiration in foreign languages. But Dr. Neander regards it merely as the power of speaking with a new spirit and energy on new themes.* In support of this view, he alleges Acts, x. 46, and xix. 6, which he contends cannot be explained of the faculty of speaking in foreign languages, and asks, on v. 13, 'How could a number of carnally minded men be led to explain the speaking of the disciples in foreign languages as the effect of intoxication?' His main consideration, besides these, seems to be the non-necessity, as he views it, of this gift, in order to communicate the gospel to the nations.† But perhaps the most singular part of his reasoning is that by which he attempts to dispose of the argument in favour of what we must call the natural view of the event described, derived from the astonishment of so many distinct classes of foreign Jews as are spoken of in v. 9 and 10.

'But we cannot possibly think that all these nations spoke different languages, for it is certain that in the cities of Cappadocia, Pontus, Lesser Asia, Phrygia, Pamphylia, Cyrene, and in the parts of Lybia and Egypt inhabited by Grecian and Jewish colonies, the Greek would

* 'Such exhibitions [i. e., as speaking in foreign languages] would be peculiarly adapted to draw away the mind from that which is the essence of conversion, and only to furnish aliment for an unchristian vanity. On the other hand, there seems a propriety in referring those passages to the utterance of the new things with which the mind would be filled, in the new language of a heart glowing with Christian sentiment.'—Vol. i., p. 14.

† 'But, indeed, the utility of such a gift of tongues for the spread of divine truth in the apostolic times will appear not so great, if we consider that the gospel had its first and chief sphere of action among the nations belonging to the Roman empire, where the knowledge of the Greek and Latin languages sufficed for this purpose, and that the one or the other of these languages, as it was employed in the intercourse of daily life, could not be altogether strange to the Jews.'—Vol. i., pp. 11, 12.

at that time be in general better understood than the ancient language of the country; and as this must have been known to the writer of the Acts, he could not have intended to specify so many different languages. There will remain, out of the whole catalogue of languages, only the Persian, Syriac, Arabic, Greek, and Latin. It also deserves notice, that the inhabitants of Judea are mentioned, who spoke the same language as the Galileans, only with a slight difference of pronunciation. Since then to retain the ancient view of the gift of tongues creates difficulties in this passage [!], which is the only one that can serve to support it [!!], while several parts of the narrative oppose it [!!!], and everything that is said elsewhere of this gift (χάρισμα) leads to a very different interpretation [?], the more ancient view becomes very uncertain, though we cannot arrive at a perfectly clear and certain conclusion respecting the facts which form the groundwork of the narrative. Perhaps the difficulty in the passage may be obviated in this way:—It was not unusual to designate all the disciples of the Lord, Galileans, and it might be inferred from this common appellation that they were all Galileans by birth; but it by no means follows that this was actually the case. Among the so-called Galileans some might be found whose mother-tongue was not the Galilean dialect, and who now felt themselves impelled to express the fulness of their hearts in their own provincial dialect, which, through Christianity, had become a sacred language to them, though hitherto they had been accustomed to consider the Hebrew only in that light; and it might also happen that some who lived on the confines of Galilee had learned the language of the adjacent tribes, which they now made use of, in order to be better understood by foreigners [!]. Thus, the speaking in foreign languages would be only something accidental, and not the essential of the new language of the spirit.'—Vol. i. pp. 16, 17.

It thus appears, that after every effort which ingenuity could suggest to controvert the usual interpretation, the main support of that interpretation must, in substance, be conceded. There *was* a speaking in different languages; but then these were not foreign languages, *i. e.* foreign to the speakers; in other words, among these Galileans, who were probably not all Galileans by birth, only called such as being disciples of Christ, (how strange that the Parthians, and Medes, and Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, who had just come up to keep the feast, should so immediately recognise the men who had kept company with Christ; and how very strange that Dr. Neander should construct his argument upon a derived and peculiar signification of the term Galilean, when the whole context necessarily requires the original and proper one), there were some who knew the neighbouring dialects, and used them on this occasion. What then? Were the parts of Lybia neighbouring districts? or were there, as Dr. Neander's theory requires, Parthians, Medes, Persians, natives of Mesopotamia, and those to whom the Roman was their

native language, among the disciples? Admitting, for the sake of argument, that there remain, out of the whole catalogue of languages, *only* the Persian, Syriac, Arabic, Greek, and Latin, is there a single person, unpossessed by a particular theory which must be supported, who will believe that the disciples of our Lord spoke all these languages as natives, according to the explanation of Dr. Neander, and without the special intervention of the divine Spirit? The usual interpretation is the natural one. The miracle is described in verse 4. They spoke ἑτέραις γλώσσαις, in other, *i. e.* foreign tongues; and it is explained in verse 11, by ἡμετέραις; they were heard in the languages of all the foreign Jews described as being present at the time. This was the great wonder to those strangers; but, according to Dr. Neander's explanation, the real wonder excited no surprise, while that which was no wonder at all is the prominent idea in the narrative.

The πρῶτον ψευδος of Dr. Neander's misinterpretation seems to us to be the supposition, that the object of the gift of tongues was to qualify the first disciples of our Lord for preaching the gospel to the heathen. We believe it had a different object. Tongues, as the Apostle Paul has told us (1 Cor. xiv. 22), were for a sign; and this, we have no doubt, was their object in the present instance. Dr. Neander has in one place described this gift in a manner so completely in harmony with our view, that we are astonished he should have so described it, only to adopt another, and, as it seems to us, unworthier hypothesis respecting it. He says, in language which has our fullest approbation, 'A phenomenon of this kind might have taken place, with a symbolic prophetic meaning, indicating that the new divine life would reveal itself in all the languages of mankind, as Christianity is destined to bring under its sway all the various national peculiarities. A worthy symbol of this great event!' We could scarcely make use of language more appropriate to our idea of this great Pentecostal sign. The gift was in entire harmony with the great commission given to the apostles, to 'go forth into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature.'

A second error in the hypothesis we are refuting is this:—Dr. Neander supposes that the tongues were used to instruct the congregating multitude. We believe that the instruction, of which specimens are given in the following part of the chapter, commenced when the sign was ended. This sign consisted in their speaking under inspiration, in various languages which they had never learned, the 'wonderful works of God.' Let this statement be compared with Acts x. 46, and xix. 6, the very same passages which Dr. Neander alleged in support of his views, and it will appear that the effect of this spiritual influence was the utterance of praise to God; for this is frequently the import

of προφητεύειν, which occurs in the latter passage. How different this view of the scene described in Acts ii. from that taken by Dr. Neander, we need hardly say. He supposes a number speaking at once in one room, in a state of great excitement, with a view to impart instruction. Confusion, not instruction, must have been the result of such a scene as this; but let us suppose them, under inspiration, giving utterance, in different languages, to hymns of praise, perhaps repeating Old Testament psalms, familiar to the bystanders (as *e. g.* Psalms ii. xlv. cx.), in the vernacular languages of the countries whence these Jewish strangers had come, and the scene is wholly different. We have excitement indeed, and no wonder, for the divine Spirit is *sensibly* present; but every inspired person is so rapt in praise, as to be unconscious of interruption from others; and the work of the Spirit, as a sign, thus produces its due effect. With this view, also, the effect upon the assembly agrees. While men of every nation recognise the miracle in this marvellous utterance of praise, and inquire with earnestness into its meaning, others, who are either too distant to hear what was uttered, or too careless to interest themselves in the phenomenon, regard it as a disorderly and drunken assembly. Then Peter—the peculiar influence we have described, and which we have assumed to be only a sign for the occasion, having ceased to move the disciples—steps forward, and justifies this work of the Spirit to the assembled multitude, who now experience its influence in another manner.

We have deemed it respectful to the illustrious name of Neander thus to detail at length the grounds of our dissent from him, in the first instance we were compelled to give of his dealing rationalistically with scripture; and the same reason induced us to offer our own explanation of the subject; but it will be impossible to do the same with the other instances. In reference to the second which we think it right to notice, we shall, therefore, to avoid discussion, content ourselves with placing in the margin* the expressions to which we object; while we gratify

* In reference to the manner in which Cornelius was prompted to seek out Peter, his own narrative is the only immediate source of information; but we are not justified to assume that Cornelius, who certainly could best testify of the facts relating to his own state of mind, of what he had himself experienced, was equally capable of clearly distinguishing the objective, the external matter of fact, from the subjective of his own mental state, in what presented itself to him as an object of his own experience and perception. It was natural, also, for him not to think of tracing out the connexion of the higher revelations made to him, with the preparative natural circumstances; but that the divine in the affair, which wholly occupied his thoughts, should remain alone in his remembrance, and be brought forward in his narrative; while the preparatives, in the natural connexion of causes and effects, retired into the back-ground.' (Vol. i. p. 79.)—'The appearance of the angel may be considered as an objective event. . . . We need not sup-

our personal feelings by recording in the text a passage, taken from the narrative of the same event, which proves with what integrity of faith our author is willing to be a disciple of the divine word. The note belonging to this paragraph, and the ensuing extract, are both taken from Dr. Neander's account of Cornelius, vol. i. pp. 76—88.

'We are also permitted and justified to supply many circumstances, which, though not expressly mentioned, are yet to be supposed; *not in order to obscure what was divine in the event*, but to glorify the manifold wisdom of God, as shewn in the way men are led to a participation of redemption, in the connexion of the divine and natural, and in the harmony which subsists between nature and grace.'—Vol. i. p. 79.

This passage fully justifies what we stated above, that what there was that might *have the effect* of lowering the impression of a divine supernatural agency, was not, in Dr. Neander, the result of an infidel spirit. Passages of the character to which we object, and of which, let it not be forgotten, there are very many in the work before us, may, we are satisfied, all be accounted for by considering that Dr. Neander, having constantly upon his heart the recovery of his countrymen from error, throws himself into their point of view, the better to refute their objections; and, by so doing, has in some respects realized in himself unconsciously the cast of sentiment most opposite to his own spirit. He is not the only distinguished instance we could point out of a great mind unconsciously influenced in this way by his opponents in controversy. We trust, however, that we have said

pose any sensible appearance, for we know not whether a higher spirit cannot communicate itself to men living in a world of sense, by an operation on the inward sense; so that this communication should appear under the form of a sensuous perception. Meanwhile, Cornelius himself is the only witness for the objective reality of the angelic appearance, and he can only be taken as a credible witness of what he *believed* that he had perceived. . . . From the whole turn of this narrative it may be inferred, that Cornelius considered the pointing out of Peter's place of residence, not as something that came to his knowledge in a natural way, but by a supernatural communication. It is indeed possible that he had heard it mentioned by others casually in conversation, but as he had not thought further about it, it had completely escaped his recollection; and now, in this elevated state of mind, what had been forgotten was brought back again to his consciousness, without his thinking of the natural connexion.' (pp. 81, 82.)—The reader will remember that these expressions may have some injustice done them by being separated from the rest of the narrative. Dr. Neander admits the reality of a supernatural communication. He thinks it probable that this was made, not to the outward senses, but by vision to the inward sense. This, we admit, would not in any way impair the supernatural fact; but then he supposes a mixture of natural and supernatural, of which the narrative in Acts has not even a trace; and this we consider a very dangerous expedient, though with him habitual, in an exposition of the sacred scriptures.

enough to prove the great necessity of caution in the use of his work, and that the other instances which we had noted down for specific mention will be excused by the courteous reader. It is anything but a gratification to us, however necessary, to dwell upon the blemishes of a work like this.

We stated, in an early part of this paper, that we should take a cursory view of the sixth book, which treats of the apostolic doctrine. Our remarks will necessarily be brief, but sufficient, we hope, to characterize—and we can pretend to no more—what our learned author has written on the subject. It is gratifying to see that while Dr. Neander enters into a separate investigation of the theological contents of each inspired doctrinal writer's authorship, he has not, like most of his countrymen, overlooked the essential harmony which pervades them all, or sought for inconsistencies and contradictions in their various applications of the same doctrinal truth. 'The doctrine of Christ,' he well observes,

'was not given as a rigid dead letter, in one determinate form of human character, but it was announced as the word of spirit and of life, with a living flexibility and variety, *by men enlightened by the Divine Spirit*, who received and appropriated it in a living manner, in accordance with their various constitutional qualities, and the difference of their course of life and education. This difference served to manifest the living unity, the riches, and the depth of the Christian spirit, in the manifoldness of the forms of conception, which unintentionally illustrated each other, and supplied their mutual deficiencies. Christianity, indeed, was designed and adapted to appropriate and elevate the various tendencies of human character, to blend them by means of a higher unity, and, agreeably to the design of the peculiar fundamental tendencies of human nature, to operate through them for the realization of the ideal of man, and the exhibition of the kingdom of God in the human race through all ages.'—Vol. ii. p. 77.

In the development of this inspired Christian doctrine, our author then distinguishes 'three leading tendencies; the Pauline, the Jacobean (between which the Petrine forms an intermediate link), and the Johannean.' Every attentive reader of the New Testament must have noticed what we may call the constitutional difference apparent in the authorship of these three disciples; but this no more implies diversity of sentiment between them, than the different bearings of doctrinal and practical argument in Paul's epistles, occasioned by the diversity of circumstances and disposition in those to whom he wrote, betrayed any looseness of theological principle in him. Peter has, in his second epistle, referred to the special character of Paul's instruction, while he spoke according to the wisdom which was given him; and Paul, while distinguishing the diversities of ministration in

the church, presses the consideration, that it was the same spirit which ministered in all. We therefore approve of the remark of Dr. Nitzsch, which Neander has appended as a note to the passage last cited, that 'to disown them [*i. e.* these distinct leading tendencies] in favour of a one-sided dogmatism, is to abandon that completeness and solidity which these modes of contemplating the Christian faith impart, while they reciprocally complete one another. It is to slight that by which scripture truth maintains its elevation above all conflicting systems.'

Although the analysis of the theology of Paul is, of course, more elaborate than that of either of the other apostles, we shall not select an extract from that chapter, but pass on to where our author describes, in the following chapter, the diverse phases of the one true doctrine respecting justification, as presented by Paul and James. The extract is long, but the subject is a controverted one, and our readers will be gratified to see Neander's opinion upon it. Besides what follows, there are some very discriminating observations on James's doctrine of justification in the first chapter of Book IV. We have put in italics a few lines particularly deserving of attention.

'Paul was obliged to point out to those who placed their dependence on the justifying power of the works of the law, the futility of such works in reference to justification, and to demonstrate that justification and sanctification could proceed only from the faith of the gospel. James, on the other hand, found it necessary to declare to those who imagined that they could be justified in God's sight by faith in the Jewish sense, as we have before explained, that this was completely valueless, if their course of life was not conformed to it.

'This apostle affirms, that as sympathy towards the distressed, which shews itself in mere verbal professions, is worthless, so faith without works is utterly vain. He compares a faith that does not manifest itself by works to a pretended love which is not verified by active kindness. From this comparison it is evident, that as what he here describes as a vain love, is, in his judgment, undeserving of the name of love, the same may be said of a vain faith; *but as by what he says against the value of a love that only shews itself in words, he did not intend to depreciate the worth of love itself, just as little could he design to cast a slight on the worth of faith, by what he says against the value of a faith that exhibits itself only in outward profession.* He considers such a faith, which is unaccompanied by works, as dead; it is a faith which is destitute of the divine life that spontaneously produces good works. In reference to this necessary intimate connexion between faith and works, James says, addressing a man who depends on this inoperative faith (ii. 18), 'Shew me how thy faith can exist without thy works, and I will prove to thee my faith by my works.' As the body without the soul is dead, so, he says (ii. 26), faith without works is dead. The comparison must be here general, without de-

scending to particulars. *It is evident that James could not mean to say that works (the outward act) bear the same relation to faith as the soul to the body, but only (which agrees with the whole train of his thinking) that the absence of works is a proof that the faith is destitute of what corresponds to the soul, as the animating principle of the body, Works, therefore, are signs of the vitality of faith.*

‘We shall be assisted in forming correct ideas of his doctrine respecting faith, if we examine the examples which he adduces of genuine and spurious faith; on the one hand, the faith of evil spirits in one God, which only fills them with terror; and, on the other, the faith of Abraham. It is evident, that, speaking from the standing point of those whose opinions he is combating, he here applies the same term to two distinct affections of the soul. In the first case, where the reference is to the case of evil spirits, the feeling of dependence in an Almighty Supreme Being shews itself as something unavoidable, as an overpowering force; but it is only a passive state (a *παθος*), with which the spontaneity, the free receptivity, and self-activity of the mind by no means corresponds: the whole internal constitution of a rational being is opposed to it. In the second case, faith is not merely something passive, existing independently of the self-determination of man, but a voluntary recognition of this dependence takes place by an act of the will, and thereby becomes a regulating principle of the whole life. Hence, in the former instance, works, as well as the whole tendency of the life, must stand in contradiction to what, from this standing point, is called faith; in the latter, the inward tendency of the life, proceeding from faith, necessarily manifests itself by works. That work of Abraham which the apostle adduces, was indeed no other than an expression of that unconditional and trustful surrender to the divine will, which is likewise by Paul considered as a mark of Abraham’s genuine and divinely approved *δικαιοσύνη*.

‘Paul adduces this example with a special reference to its internal principle in opposition to a vain righteousness of works. James makes use of it in its outward manifestation against an *opus operatum* of faith; and in this point of view he could say that by his *εργα*, Abraham proved that he was a *δικαιος*. Faith co-operated with his works, by works his *πιστις* proved itself to be *τελεία*. When the Holy Scriptures tell us that Abraham’s faith was imputed to him by God for righteousness, this can only be understood of a faith which was accompanied with good works as marks of its genuineness. Certainly James, who believed in the divine omniscience, could not suppose that the outward act was requisite to make Abraham’s disposition manifest to God; but he meant to say that Abraham’s faith could not have justified him before God, if it had not been such as would manifest its inward quality by such works. But Paul would not have applied the same term *πιστις* to two religious standing points that differed so widely from one another; he would hardly have designated by this name what James asserts of evil spirits.

‘A contradiction, indeed, may appear to exist between the two apostles in this respect, that while one gives as a mark of the standing

point of legal righteousness, 'do this and thou shalt live;' the other, expressing his own views, says, 'a doer of the work shall be blessed by (or in) his deed.' But this contradiction vanishes, if we are careful to distinguish the different references of these two statements. Paul speaks of the *νομος* as of the sum of certain imperative prescriptions, and of man under the legal standing-point antecedent to Christianity. James intends the new law of life revealed by the Messiah, which he designates the *νομος τελειος*, in allusion to its forming the consummation of Judaism, as Christ in his sermon on the Mount represents the gospel to be the fulfilling of the law. Viewing it under this aspect, he calls it (i. 25) the law of liberty, no doubt from the fact, that those who truly received it rendered a free obedience, which proceeded from an inward vital principle. He considers this law as equivalent to the *λογος*, the published doctrine of Christ. This doctrine is called a law, as exhibiting a rule of life, at the same time it is distinguished by such epithets as the *perfect* law and the law *of liberty*, that Paul would not have scrupled to term the gospel a law, if thus designated. And it is all along implied, that through Christ the perfection and freedom of religion are established, compared with the defectiveness of the former dispensation, which was one of bondage. Referring to the doctrine of Christ as being such a law, he says, what Paul must have said of Christianity as the *νομος πνευματος*, that mere knowledge would be of no avail, but that the essential point was, not to make this doctrine an object of indolent contemplation, but to feel its power as a law determining the life. Whosoever practically received this doctrine would be blessed in his deed. Only he who allowed his life to be regulated by Christianity, could experience its blessed effects. He alone would feel himself truly blessed in the influence proceeding from Christianity.

'In relation to moral requirements, James was very unlike the advocates of a legal righteousness, who insisted more on a multiplicity of individual good works than in the regulation of the whole life by one leading principle: for it is one of the characteristics of this epistle, with which his argument respecting faith is closely connected, that he traces back, believing, knowing, and acting, to the unity of a whole life proceeding from a godlike disposition, and opposes the isolation of acts, which can maintain their true significance only in this connexion.' —Vol. ii., pp. 228—232.

The closing paragraph of the preceding extract is worthy of particular attention, not only for its truth, but on account of the great stress laid upon the principle stated in it, in the moral systems of Neander, Tholuck, and the writers belonging to their school. It is unnecessary to give any further specimens of the *doctrinal* investigations in this work, as all that we have said upon, and quoted from it, goes to show that it must be regarded, even more than most books, merely as the material of thought and reflection to well-disciplined serious minds. The peculiar phraseology of the volumes will not have escaped the notice of the reader. This has its origin in a style of thinking and idea

with which the English mind is not familiar, and must be allowed to be a disadvantage; but pains and patience will obtain the mastery over it.

What now remains to be said, must regard the work as a translation. As we have stated that in proper hands it may be very useful, its enterprising publisher is entitled to the thanks of British readers for undertaking to publish it in English. He has also done well in committing the task of translation to Mr. Ryland; for though that gentleman lacks, we believe, one not unimportant qualification for translating so difficult a work as this—*i. e.*, a familiarity (obtained by residing in German society) with the peculiarities of the various theological schools of modern Germany,—yet this is in great measure compensated by his extensive reading in that language, and his great ability, which this translation abundantly proves, in apprehending clearly and forcibly the diversified phases of thought which pass before him. In every respect he may be said to have well discharged his office; but the full meaning of that judgment can only be appreciated by those who are acquainted with the original. The work is, indeed, so difficult, that in advising with friends, as we have done more than once, respecting a translation of it, we always suggested the importance of a preliminary dissertation, to be written with the special object of putting the mere English reader, as nearly as possible, on a par with those for whom the work was originally prepared. But what is done is well done, and we are truly glad that the translation was made by so competent a hand. The meaning has not only been accurately seized, but well expressed. The style of the translation is as good as that of such an original well can be. We must own that, in many parts, the translation is the more readable book of the two.

But we must here repeat the recommendation which in a recent number of this journal was urged upon the publisher of this valuable series—greater attention to typographical accuracy. Where the blame falls we do not know, principally perhaps upon the public, who, we think, have not patronized the series in any fair proportion to its merits, and the very extensive outlay which it must have occasioned the publisher. We believe that if the risk and cost of publication were better remunerated, there would be less reason to complain of the typography. But the fact is, the typography is truly German—in other words, so incorrect, that the work before us ought, like most German books, to have its half sheet at least of *corrigenda*. ‘Bauer’ for ‘Baur’ occurs more than once. ‘Tubingen’ for ‘Tübingen,’ vol. i. p. 123; ‘Denkwirdigkerten’ for ‘Denkwürdigkeiten,’ vol. i. p. x.; ‘Bible’ for ‘Bibel;’ ‘Schneckenburgh’ for ‘Schneckenburger;’ ‘Wur-

tumburg' for 'Württemberg.' These are a few specimens of errata in German. In vol. i. p. 222, we have 'Isodorus' (of Pelusium) for 'Isidorus.' The iota subscript of the Greek dative is several times omitted. And in Hebrew words, not only are the proper points occasionally omitted or transposed, but one letter is often substituted for another. The translator intimates in his preface that there was a necessity that as little delay as possible should occur in the preparation of the work, and this necessity, whatever it was, may as fairly be pleaded in extenuation of typographical errors, as of any literary inadvertencies of the translator; but yet such inaccuracies should not be, and we must express our hope that greater care, on his own part, and a more adequate remuneration for his outlay, risk, and trouble, on the part of the public, will enable Mr. Clark, in future volumes, to meet every reasonable expectation of their purchasers.

Art. III. *Lehrbuch der Mechanischen Technologie.* (*Compendium of Mechanical Technology.*) By C. W. Rüst. Berlin. 1839.

Technological Literature. Its origin and progress in Germany.

THE literature of industry and the useful arts, the new offspring of our utilitarian age, has within the last few years assumed an important rank among her elder sisters. Before the middle of the last century, treatises on the useful arts were not only of rare appearance, but also of a purely abstract and speculative character, so that few took any interest in their perusal, and fewer still derived any practical benefit from them. This apparent neglect of technological literature was owing partly to the contempt in which the various branches of industry were held by the better educated portion of society, and partly to the spirit of exclusiveness so peculiar to the former times, when free competition was numbered among things inimical to national welfare, and the useful arts bore the same character of mystery as the occult sciences did in the middle ages, the members of the fraternity doing their utmost to keep the principles of their trade a secret from the public. Moreover, the guarantees of success in the mechanical trades were more sought in individual skill and manual dexterity than in the application of general principles, and their better development by means of mutual and public communication. Neither was the absolute influence which mathematics and the physical sciences now-a-days exercise on the mechanical arts, at all felt in the previous periods, when the artisan confined himself exclusively to mechanical and manual proficiency. Nor was the circumscribed activity of the press in those times more calculated

to promote the rapid development of the principles of the arts, by diligently giving publicity to any new phenomenon that resulted from the experiments made by some adept in a distant part of the civilized globe.

It was in the year 1761 that the French academy of Paris first began to publish a collection of minute descriptions of the various ways and processes peculiar to the useful arts, accompanied with numerous and well-executed illustrations, under the title, '*Description des Arts et des Métiers faites ou approuvées par MM. de l'Academie.*' An enterprise of such a novel character could not fail to attract the attention of the civilized world, and more especially of the thinking Germans, whose industrious pens soon occupied the press with works of a similar nature, which were, however, all left unfinished for want of pecuniary means, as no literary society was at that time in existence in Germany, whose exchequer might have advanced the requisite outlay.

An imperfect translation of the French work began to appear in 1762, and was continued after many interruptions, and under several publishers, until 1805, when it stopped altogether, after having reached the twenty-fifth volume, from want of public patronage, most of the articles being more suited for French than German industry. A few attempts, however, from that period, to remodel the French work for the use of the German artisan, deserve particular notice, and more especially when we consider the many difficulties the authors had to surmount. Foremost in merit stands the work of Sprengel (continued by Hartwig), which appeared in Berlin from 1768—1795, in seventeen parts, under the title, '*Handwerke und Künste in Tabellen,*' (trades and arts in tables.) The merit of the work is enhanced by the circumstance that all the minute descriptions therein are the result of personal inquiry, contemplation, and study, without in the least having relied on mere hearsay. It embraces a great number of mechanical trades then practised in the Prussian dominions, which are analyzed with precision and clearness.

Aware at last of the utter impossibility of furnishing Germany with complete and detailed monographies of the various trades and arts by mere individual exertion, the thought of concentrating and abridging such a work in the form of a compendium, soon suggested itself to some literati, and the first attempt of the kind was made by Beckmann in Göttingen, in 1777, by his work, '*Auleitung zur Technologie*' (Guide to Technology), who was also the first who introduced that word (technology) in modern literature. The merits of the work, in an historical point of view, are invaluable, though its defects in practical knowledge nearly overbalance them, since it not only confines itself

to but a very limited number of mechanical trades (mostly of a chemical nature), but it describes them also so very loosely as to be of no practical use without the assistance of a teacher. Nor is there anything like a scientific survey of the whole sphere of industry, or even a critical analysis of some detached branches, the work being of a purely historical character. Nevertheless, the first impulse was thereby given to a literary survey of the arts, while the work itself so far met the demands of the times, that it went through five editions in less than twenty-five years, not to mention numerous piratical reprints in the various states in Germany. The novelty of the undertaking diverted attention from its defects, or rendered them at least less glaring, while the author himself (Beckmann) aimed afterwards at a more critical survey of the mechanical arts, by his work, 'Entwurf zur allgemeinen Technologie' (Sketch of General Technology), which he published at Göttingen, in 1806—a work which may truly be said to have formed the stepping-stone to the eminent station which the useful arts now occupy.

It led, above all, to the strong line of demarcation that was henceforth drawn between *special* and *general* technology, as two distinct branches of literature. In *special* technology a description is given of the whole series of processes raw material undergoes before it assumes the form and character of a finished article; while in *general* technology the various modes of operation are described, which various materials undergo to obtain analogously one and the same end. Thus, under the head '*division or diminution*,' are found various methods practised on different materials to reduce them to that state, such as cleaving, cutting, tearing, breaking, rubbing, pressing, beating, scraping, &c. Again, under the head '*Combination or Augmentation*,' are specified various ways to accomplish that end, according to the nature of the material, and the purpose of its use, such as binding, twisting, knitting, weaving, sowing, cementing, gluing, nailing, screwing, rivetting, soldering, &c.; while under the head '*Formation or Shaping*,' are given the various mechanical expedients to form a material into a desired object, such as hewing, planing, turning, carving, casting, melting, &c. It is obvious that a detailed account of the various operations in the mechanical trades, after such a plan, must open even to the common artisan a mine of knowledge, and suggest to him the possibility of effecting improvements in his profession by the application of new principles, the source of all inventions.

No sooner, however, had Beckmann suggested this new field of practical knowledge, than a host of writers attempted its cultivation, all of whom, however, entirely failed in their new enterprise, from deficiency in practical knowledge, having

taken as their guide throughout, either the work of the French Academy or that of Sprengel-Hartwig, without considering that time in its progress carries with it also that of things, and that matters have greatly changed even in the workshop of the common mechanic since the year 1760. An honourable exception must, however, be made of two writers whose profundity in system, and close and clear analysis in the practical treatment of their subjects, place them in relieve among the vast group of writers of that period. We mean *Hermbstädt* and *Poppe*.

Hermbstädt of Berlin (now deceased), a man deeply versed in practical chemistry, cultivated more particularly the chemical part of technology, and his observations are mostly founded on the results of his own experiments. His works on brandy distilling, beer-brewing, leather fabrication, and dying, have acquired universal celebrity. He was, however, less successful in his subsequent work on General Technology, which he published in 1814, owing to his want of practical knowledge on various subjects he undertakes to treat of. As late as 1830, though then at a very advanced age, he published another edition of that work, making, however, but little improvement in it.

Poppe (a pupil of Beckmann, now in Tübingen), commenced authorship with a work which gave promise of a glorious literary career. His maiden work on the 'History of Technology' (Göttingen, 1807—1811), contains a valuable mass of facts and dates in the history of inventions, and is undeniably the result of deep study and personal observation. Dazzled, however, by the success attending that first work, he subsequently undertook to treat of subjects with which he was less familiar, thus deteriorating instead of increasing his literary reputation. We allude to his works 'Manual of General Technology' (Frankfort, 1807), 'Compendium of General Technology' (1809), and 'Complete Guide to General Technology, (Stuttgart, 1821.) In the latter work the author endeavours to follow out the hint given him by his master, Beckmann, but lack of practical information renders the work more a theoretical and historical treatise than one of substantial use for the mechanic. Nor are his other publications, 'Technological Lexicon' (1816—1820), 'Compendium of Special Technology' (1819—1838), and 'Complete Theory of National Industry' (1833—1834, and still unfinished), more distinguished in a practical point of view.

By far more profound and original are the works of Chr. Bernoulli, of Basle, of which we will only mention his 'Manual of Technology' (Basle, 1833, 1834), and his writings on 'Cotton Manufactory,' 'Steam Engines,' which are alike distinguished both for their practical profundity and scientific analysis.

The branch of 'Economical Technology' has recently been treated in an eminent and masterly way by v. Otto, of Brunswick, in his 'Compendium of rational Practice of the Agricultural Professions.'

A mine of practical information, founded on scientific principles, is open to the mechanical enquirer, in the valuable 'Technological Encyclopædia' published by Cotta, and edited by Prechtel, of Vienna, who, together with Altmütter and Karmarsch, are the most distinguished contributors to that work, as regards original articles. From 1830 to 1837, eight large volumes have appeared, enriched with upwards of two hundred copper plates. The said Altmütter is besides known by his important work, 'Collection of the Instruments in the Polytechnic Institution at Vienna;' while Karmarsch (pupil of the former) is well-known in the literary world by his works 'Introduction to the Mechanical Principles of Technology,' and 'Compendium of Technology.'

Of the vast number of existing periodicals on the useful arts in Germany, we shall be content with mentioning the most conspicuous. The first place must be assigned to the 'Polytechnic Journal,' published by Cotta, and edited by Dr. Dingler, a most valuable repository of all the remarkable phases in the inventions of the arts that occur throughout Europe. Next in rank stands the 'Polytechnic Central Journal' (Leipsic), containing profound views on select subjects in the arts. The 'Magazine of the most recent Inventions' (Leipsic), is in extent and importance much inferior to the two former, and has of late limited its labours almost exclusively to translations from the 'London Mechanics' Magazine.'

The 'Annals of the Polytechnic Institution of Vienna,' have not appeared regularly within the last few years, but the essays in it are always remarkable for depth of knowledge and originality of conception. The numerous societies which have of late been formed throughout Germany for the promotion and encouragement of the mechanical arts, have given rise to many magazines which are conducted with more or less skill, according to the abilities of the editors. The most distinguished are—'Transactions of the Society for the Promotion of Industry in Prussia,' 'Communications for Commerce and Trade,' published by a similar society in Bohemia, and other magazines under the same title, by the Societies of Saxony, Bavaria, &c. Nor ought we to omit the important periodicals 'Archive for Mineralogy, Geognosy, and Mining,' edited by Karsten (Berlin), the 'Journal of the Art of Printing,' by Meyer (Brunswick), and the 'Journal for Cabinet Makers and Upholsterers,' by Kimbel (Mentz), all replete with ample and profound practical information.

The beneficial effects arising from the promotion of technological

literature in general, are of a twofold nature. It not only tends to initiate the unprofessional into the principles of the various trades, but to render also the mechanic himself more proficient in his art. Knowledge of the useful arts seems now to be included in common education, chiefly owing to the rising state of the middle classes, who, coming in daily contact with professional men and artisans, are neither too proud to be conversant with the principles of the useful arts, nor so devoid of common sense as not to be aware of the pecuniary advantages accruing from such information, as it enables them to estimate at their due value the mechanical works done for them. Nor has the prevalent spirit of inquiry, so peculiar to our age, contributed less to extend our research from nature and her materials, to the objects man forms out of them. The tendency, moreover, of our day, to establish manufactories on an extensive scale has naturally created a new class in society, as an intermediate link between purely scientific and reflecting men on the one hand, and the labouring masses on the other—a class that partakes at once of the pursuits of both, thus uniting, as it were, body and soul together.

As to the advantages accruing to the mechanic himself from the promotion of technological literature, they are too obvious to require explanation, as most inventions in the arts are the offspring of the application of a new principle, or a principle hitherto alien to a certain art, but which the inventor makes practical use of, having become familiar with it by studying the elements of other arts.

Art. IV. *The United Irishmen, their Lives and Times.* By R. R. Madden, M.D., Author of 'Travels in the East,' &c. &c. 2 vols. London: J. Madden and Co., Leadenhall-street. 1842.

THE Irish rebellion of 1798 is but little understood in this country. The causes in which it originated, the agents by whom it was planned, the ends it was designed to subserve, and the means by which it was suppressed, are alike misapprehended, or but very partially known. Ignorance of the more important facts of the case, with strong prejudices against the religion whose secular interests are supposed to have prompted the outbreak, have in general characterized the judgments of our countrymen on this subject. The excitement, both political and religious, which prevailed at the time, greatly favoured the policy of those who were interested in misleading the national judgment; and the succession of stirring events since that day, aided by the strong religious antipathies of our people, has prevented

a calm review of the opinions then formed. False and pernicious views have in consequence continued to influence our theories and policy respecting Irish affairs. Prejudice has retained its supremacy, and the evil passions which follow in its wake have flourished beneath its auspices and protection. It is time that a better state of things should be introduced. A sufficient interval has elapsed since 1798 for the judgment to recover its self-possession and coolness; whilst the evidence accumulated during that period places us in a position as favourable as can be desired for a dispassionate and enlarged view of the whole matter.

Mr. Moore's *Life of Lord Edward Fitzgerald* was of great service to the cause of historical truth, and other works which have recently appeared have in like manner contributed to clear away the mists of prejudice, and the false representations of unprincipled and interested witnesses. Such publications have usually been met with a furious outcry from writers of the Tory school. Judging from the language which they adopt on such occasions, we might be led to imagine that the party for which they write had always been the warmest friends of Ireland, the most solicitous to allay her feuds, to heal her divisions, to bind up her wounds. They are so anxious to avoid all recurrence to topics which can irritate a proverbially excitable people,—are so desirous that past insults and injuries should be forgotten, in order that future friendship and good offices may be cultivated,—they deem the bare mention of former animosities, the mere historical detail of English misgovernment and English deception in Ireland as so heinous an offence, that judging from their words and apparent earnestness, we might readily conclude that Ireland was the pet child of toryism, the object of its fondest, most forbearing, and most disinterested love. We need not say how far this is from the truth. If there be one thing which Ireland curses more heartily than any other, it is English toryism, transplanted to, and rendered still more rank in, Irish soil. The fruit it has borne has been bitter in the extreme, and the hatred engendered is in consequence identified with the deepest and most cherished feelings of the Irish heart.

The history of toryism in Ireland exhibits in a disgusting light the hypocrisy of these professions of moderation and good-will. Its advocates know that its deeds have been evil—that it has reigned by terror, not by affection—has consulted the interests of the few by the sacrifice of the many—and therefore it is that they deprecate the faithful record of its deeds. They are well aware that the verdict of impartial history must be against it, and they would therefore have that history remain unwritten. It is safer for them to trust, and they well know it, to the industriously propagated statements of their own partisans, than to commit their

cause to the decision of a judge whom neither their bribes nor their threats can influence. Dr. Madden has no doubt made up his mind to the sort of abuse with which his work will meet from this quarter, and will treat it as it deserves. For our own part we thank him most heartily for the labour he has undertaken, and proceed, without further comment, to acquaint our readers with the general character of his volumes. His object, as stated by himself, is 'to do justice to the United Irishmen, to point out the wrongs by which they were goaded to resistance, the nature of the political evils they desired to remove from their suffering country, the good at which they aimed, and the errors into which they were betrayed.'

The elucidation of this portion of our history has been steadily kept in view, and no pains have been spared to effect it. 'Setting out with the determination 'to extenuate nought, and to set down nought in malice,' he has devoted some labour and expense to collecting documents which, in the ordinary course of events, must soon have been lost irrecoverably, from whence any reasonable readers, unprejudiced by party, may be able to form a correct estimate of the motives and actions of men, who have hitherto been praised and blamed with little or no reference to the real circumstances of their conduct or their principles.' The following brief extract from our author's preface will probably startle some of our readers, while it may serve to prepare them for the subsequent disclosures of his work:—

'Little do the people of England know of the class of persons who were driven into rebellion. Englishmen may probably have heard that a number of obscure, ill-disposed, and reckless men, had engaged in an unnatural and unprovoked rebellion, and were executed; that the leaders of it were poor, discontented, embarrassed wretches, persons of no standing in society, of no character in private life, contaminated by revolutionary doctrines and popish principles. If such persons read this work, they will find that a great portion of these unfortunate persons were gentlemen by birth, education, and profession;—many of them celebrated for their talents, respected for their private worth; several of them scholars who had distinguished themselves in the University of Dublin; the majority of them members of the Established Church; some of them Presbyterian ministers; few, if any, of them who did not exert more or less influence over their countrymen.'

—Vol. i., p. xi.

It becomes us at the outset to remark, that we see little to admire in the character and policy of the principal agents of the Irish rebellion. With few exceptions, their patriotism was far from being of the highest and least questionable order. A goading sense of the wrongs inflicted on their country was their ruling passion, and, together with the sufferings which they en-

dured, constituted their only claim on the sympathy of mankind. Of political forethought and practical wisdom they were wholly destitute, and their plans were consequently distinguished by rashness and irresolution, a blindness to the dangers which they hazarded, and a self-exaggeration which betokened minds of an inferior order. The power of public sentiment was not then known in Ireland, and the physical was in consequence preferred to the moral, in utter disregard of the dictates of prudence, and the terrible calamities to which their country was thereby exposed. The mania of French republicanism and infidelity had spread over the nation like a torrent, and swept away all the precautionary landmarks which the experience of former ages had erected.

Dr. Madden's work, necessarily of a desultory character, is preceded by *An Historical Introduction*, furnished by a literary friend, which traces with considerable ability, and in a luminous style, the history of our relations with Ireland. It is a melancholy, and, to England, a disgraceful tale which this chapter tells. We would that it were otherwise; but the truth must be known, in order that the existing state of feeling should be understood, and the errors and crimes of a former system be avoided. Referring to the rebellion which spread such terror through England in the time of Charles the First, and to Cromwell's campaign which followed, the writer of this *Introduction* remarks:—

‘ This dreadful war, in which both sides manifested an equal degree of exterminating fury, is one of the most perplexing recorded in the annals of any country, from the great variety of the parties engaged, and from their rancorous hostility towards each other. The English were divided into the friends of the parliament and the friends of the king; the latter again were subdivided into a party disposed to grant reasonable terms to the catholic lords, and a party which agreed with the puritans that popery should not be tolerated; all were, however, united in a desire that advantage should be taken of the commotions to reap a new harvest of confiscations and grants. On the other side were the Lords of the Pale, Catholics, indeed, by religion, but English by descent, inclination, and prejudice, zealous royalists, and the more so as the king's enemies upbraided him with a secret inclination in favour of popery;—the Irish of the north, whose chief anxiety was to recover their ancient lands and expel the intrusive settlers;—the men of Connaught and Leinster, whose great objects were to attain security for their property, and toleration for their religion,—a large body, chiefly among the southern Irish, aiming at establishing the independence of their country under a Catholic Sovereign appointed by the pope;—there were other subdivisions of party, each obstinately bent on its own object, without any regard for the general interest of the country, or any very fixed principle of action. Had it been possible for the Catholic royalists to trust the Protestant friends of the king,

and the native Irish to coalesce with the Lords of the Pale, Ireland would have been tranquillized and secured for the king in a week, for the Puritans were a miserable minority; but during the whole duration of the civil war in England, the several divisions of the royal party in Ireland spent their time in despicable squabbles, which served no purpose but to increase their mutual animosities.

‘In the midst of the almost incredible blunders and follies of the royalists and the Irish, Cromwell landed, and by the massacres of Drogheda and Wexford, diffused terror over the land. But even these fearful warnings failed to produce an union of parties; the friends of the Papal Nuncio thwarted the plans of the king’s lieutenant; the Protestant royalists openly expressed dislike of their allies; the native Irish could not be brought to coalesce with men of English descent. Whichever party prevailed in the council, the minority took vengeance for defeat by betraying the common cause to the common enemy; and it seemed as if Cromwell had only to look on tranquilly until his adversaries had torn each other to pieces. But he was too hurried to wait; he marched onward, marking his track by fire and desolation. Some places, particularly Clonmel, made a resistance which would have afforded an opportunity for changing the whole course of the war, but the Commissioners of Trust, appointed by the council of confederate parties, countermanded the orders of the lord-lieutenant, and he thwarted every one of their projects; the garrisons were abandoned to their fate, and a handful of Puritans became masters of Ireland. The confederates had nothing more to do than to dispute which party had the greatest share in producing such a calamity.’—*Ib.*, p. 13—15.

The association of United Irishmen grew out of the Irish volunteers, when the latter organization departed from its original principles by refusing to advocate the emancipation of the Catholics. By this suicidal act it lost the confidence of the people, and soon fell before the suspicions and fears of the English government. The period of its existence, as an organized military association, was from 1777 to 1793, two years prior to the latter of which dates the first society of United Irishmen was formed at Belfast, by Theobald Wolfe Tone, a young barrister of considerable promise. Amongst the resolutions adopted by the Belfast Society at its first general meeting, it is declared that the sole constitutional mode by which the undue influence of the English government over the affairs of Ireland can be opposed, ‘is by a complete and radical reform of the representation of the people in parliament,’ and ‘that no reform is just which does not include Irishmen of every religious profession.’ The two great principles of parliamentary reform and catholic emancipation were thus explicitly announced as the main objects of the association, and for some time continued, notwithstanding the republicanism of individual members, to be its distinctive badge. The organization spread rapidly through the country. In Novem-

ber, 1791, a society was formed at Dublin, when the following test, to be taken by every member on admission, was adopted:—

‘ ‘ I, A. B., in the presence of God, do pledge myself to my country, that I will use all my abilities and influence in the attainment of an impartial and adequate representation of the Irish nation in parliament; and as a means of absolute and immediate necessity in the establishment of this chief good of Ireland, I will endeavour, as much as lies in my ability, to forward a brotherhood of affection, an identity of interests, a communion of rights, and an union of power, among Irishmen of all religious persuasions, without which every reform in parliament must be partial, not national, inadequate to the wants, delusive to the wishes, and insufficient for the freedom and happiness of this country.’ ’—*Ib.*, pp. 137, 138.

The language held at the different meetings of the Society during this and the following year, was bold and imprudent, so as to afford reasonable ground to apprehend the change which speedily came over its counsels. Several state prosecutions in consequence took place, in one of which, as advocate for the accused, A. H. Rowan, Mr. Curran delivered that celebrated speech, which has probably obtained a wider circulation than any other specimen of Irish oratory of any age. In 1794, the violent language employed, and the daring publicity with which the proceedings of the Society were carried on, brought on its members the vengeance of government. On the 4th of May in that year, their ordinary place of meeting was visited by the police, and their papers were seized. An important change in the construction and recognised object of the Society speedily afterwards took place,—one which the slightest foresight might have predicted, and which was obviously the natural growth of events. The more timid and prudent part of the members retired, whilst the more enthusiastic and determined remained, and gave a thoroughly republican complexion to the association. This happened in 1795. ‘ The original test of the Society was changed into an oath of secrecy and fidelity: its original objects, reform and emancipation, were now merged in aims amounting to revolution and the establishment of a republican government.’ The organization of the Society was completed, and its branches were spread systematically over the whole country. It was imagined by the leaders of the United Irishmen that they might reckon with confidence on the fidelity of all their confederates. In this, however, they were egregiously mistaken, as the event proved. Several of the most active and noisy of their associates were in the pay of government, and contributed at once to fan the mistaken patriotism of their countrymen, and to reveal their counsels to the English ministry.

'In this catalogue of treachery, the names of persons are to be found, who were at the same time the prominent partisans—nay, the professional advocates—of the party committed in this unfortunate struggle, and the secret agents and paid servants of the government, employed as spies on their own accomplices and companions. The treason of these men to their comrades, no doubt was serviceable to government—nay more, beneficial to the country itself; but the traitors were despicable, even then, in the sight of their employers, and cannot be otherwise now, in the eyes of their successors. Every important proceeding of the United Irishmen was known to government. Lord Clare acknowledged, in a debate in the English House of Lords in 1801, that 'the United Irishmen who negotiated with the Irish government in 1798, had disclosed nothing which the king's ministers were not acquainted with before.'

'The betrayers of their society were not the poor or inferior members of it; some of them were high in the confidence of the directory; others not sworn in, but trusted in its concerns, learned in the law, social in their habits, liberal in their politics, prodigal in their expenses, needy in their circumstances, and therefore covetous of money; loose in their public and private principles, therefore open to temptation.'—*Ib.*, pp. 147—149.

A regular system of espionage was adopted in 1795. In the following year few secrets of the Society were unknown to the executive. Even their legal advisers, so thorough was the corruption of the times, were in many cases in the service of government, and received as the reward of their infamy, large donations from the public purse.

Amongst the list of informers whom the government retained, Mr. Thomas Reynolds held an infamous pre-eminence. He was a silk manufacturer in Dublin, of indifferent private character, who had been admitted to the councils, and was well acquainted with the leaders, of the Association. Dr. Madden tells us—

'The person whose disclosures of the designs of the Leinster societies of United Irishmen, government ultimately availed themselves of, was Mr. Thomas Reynolds, a silk manufacturer in the liberty, whose business had been carried on at No. 9, Park-street, the house in which he was born, on the 12th of March, 1771. On the anniversary of that day, twenty-seven years subsequently,—namely, on the 12th of March, 1798, the first striking incident in the drama of his public life took place, at the house of his friend, Oliver Bond, in Bridge-street, where the latter and fourteen others of his associates, delegates from various societies of United Irishmen, holding a provincial meeting, were arrested on his information.'—*Ib.*, pp. 212, 213.

No words can express the infamy of such a man, nor is our abhorrence diminished by any benefits to the commonwealth which may have been incidental to his treachery. His motives

were base in the last degree, and his memory is in consequence loathed by all classes of Irishmen. His pecuniary remuneration, however, was most ample. He had his reward, though even that, liberal as it was, failed to satisfy his selfish mind. The following extract shows how liberal Tory governments have been in remunerating their base and unscrupulous agents:—

‘ Documents, whose authenticity cannot be called in question, are in existence, and furnish irrefragable proof of Mr. T. Reynolds having received for his disclosures, not 500*l.* only, but the sum of 5000*l.*, in four payments, at the following dates, and in the following amounts:—

‘ 1798, Sept. 29, Mr. T. Reynolds received	-	£1000
— Nov. 16, Ditto ditto	-	2000
1799, Jan. 19, Ditto ditto	-	1000
— March 4, Ditto ditto	-	1000’

‘ to complete 5000*l.*’—And, moreover, on the 14th of June, 1799, Mr. Reynolds received his annuity of 1000*l.*, ‘in full to the 25th of March, 1799;’ from which period till his death, the 18th of August, 1836, his pension continued to be paid to him.

‘ The amount of that pension was 1000*l.* Irish, or 920*l.* British: he received it for a term of thirty-seven years.

‘ The gross amount for the above period, at 920 <i>l.</i> per annum, is	-	£34,040
Gratuity before the trials of Bond, M'Cann, and Byrne		500
Gratuities between Sept. 1798, and March 4, 1799	-	5000
Consulship at Lisbon, four years at 1400 <i>l.</i> per annum		5600
Consulship at Iceland, two years at 300 <i>l.</i> per annum	-	600
		<hr/>
		£45,740

‘ In 1810 he was appointed to the consulate at Lisbon, where he remained nearly four years, the salary and emoluments of which office averaged 1400*l.* per annum.

‘ In 1817 he was appointed to the consulate at Iceland, where he remained about one year, on a salary of 300*l.* per annum; he returned to England, and in 1819 went back to Copenhagen, where he continued a few months, and then, on leave of absence, repaired to France, leaving his son to act in his stead as vice-consul, in which office he continued till 1822; another son obtained a lucrative appointment under the stamp office department at Hull.

‘ This enormous sum of 45,740*l.*, the ‘disinterested friend of his country’ received, and as the pension on the Irish civil list reverts to his widow and to his two sons, who are now in the prime of life, it is by no means improbable that one of the parties may survive the person to whom it was originally granted some five-and-twenty or thirty years; and if so, the people of Great Britain will have the further gratification of paying another sum of twenty or five-and-twenty thousand pounds more, for the credit of Lord Castlereagh’s government in Ireland (nominally of Lord Camden’s), and as a tribute of

respect to the memory and worth of Mr. Thomas Reynolds. There are gentlemen in the British parliament, though not forgetful of the services of Mr. Reynolds, and others of his class, who may think this subject deserving of their attention, who may imagine that the children of the starving operatives of Leeds and Manchester are entitled to as much consideration as those of the gentlemen who made orphans of so many, and who during their lives were amply rewarded for any service they rendered to their employers.'—*Ib.*, pp. 240—242.

Another of these miscreants was Mr. John Hughes, a man less deeply steeped in crime than Reynolds, but sufficiently odious to merit the contempt of all virtuous men. The following passage, relating to Hughes, exhibits a refinement of craft in the art of espionage to which our annals furnish few parallels:—

'During his confinement in the house called the Donegal Arms, then the provost-prison of Belfast, the plan was carried into effect which had been very generally adopted, at this frightful period, in other parts of the country, of apprehending some of the least suspected informers, and having it rumoured abroad that such persons had been arrested as ringleaders of the rebels, who were sure to be convicted, and then placing these persons among the unfortunate prisoners, for the purpose of making the latter furnish evidence against themselves and their companions. This proceeding, which would hardly be had recourse to in any uncivilized country, in these times, is thus described by Dr. Dickson, from his own sad experience of it:—

'The first of these persons of whom I had any knowledge, or by whom I was beset, was the notorious John Hughes, a man some years before of considerable respectability, but with whom I never had any particular connexion, or even intimate acquaintance. However, he was fixed on as most likely to succeed in entrapping me and a few others. With a view to this, opportunity was taken to excite our compassion, either on the day of, or after his arrest. We were entertained with a fable truly affecting—'that there was no hope of saving his life—that his mind was deranged—that he was treated with great cruelty—and that he was placed among a crowd of poor wretches, with whom he could neither have conversation nor comfort.' This pathetic fiction was immediately followed with an observation, that 'if we could possibly make room for him, taking him to us would be an act of the greatest charity.' Completely imposed on by the tale, we instantly yielded to the application, and smothering though we were, received him into our *stove*. On his entrance, his looks and manner were wild, unsettled, and strongly marked with melancholy. Afterwards, he talked in a desponding tone of the certainty of his conviction, and sometimes of a secret conspiracy against him, in which, as it appeared, he considered some of us as concerned. At other times he would start, with seeming horror, and exclaim that the sentinel was about to shoot him. On the whole, though he sometimes talked soberly, and generally *listened attentively to our conversation*, he acted his part so well, at intervals, that during two nights and the inter-

mediate day, I was as fully convinced of his derangement as I was of my own existence; and under this impression, not only prayed with him, and for him, in his seemingly composed moments, but was quite delighted with the *wonderful* comfort which *devotional exercises* seemed to give him. Some of our party, however, suspected him of imposture from the first; and their suspicion was soon confirmed, by his being removed, for some time every day, to a distant apartment, and detained in secret conference. His total removal from us, a few days afterwards, and his *symptoms of insanity* suddenly disappearing, certainty succeeded suspicion, and his name was consigned to infamy, together with those of his employers.' —*Ib.*, pp. 321—323.

Efforts were made to involve the more moderate and constitutional reformers in the treasonable designs of the United Irishmen. Mr. Grattan was tampered with in the hope of his committing some indiscretion which might afford a plea for his arrest, but as his recent biographer remarks, he 'was by far too experienced a person to place himself in that distressing situation where he would be privy to proceedings which would have been disagreeable to him to know, and dangerous not to reveal.' Mr. Grattan was obnoxious to the ruling powers as a reformer, and still more so as one who had denounced their treachery, and acknowledged his own too easy faith in the matter of an independent legislature. In 1785 he discovered that the conceded independence of the Irish parliament, the great object of his past life, was but nominal and deceptive, and he immediately expressed his disappointment and indignation in terms which became his talents and his patriotism. This was the crowning sin of Grattan's political life, for which Lord Castlereagh and others would gladly have inflicted a merciless penalty.

Whatever may be thought of the rebellion itself, or of its prime movers, but one opinion can be entertained of the unspeakable baseness of the men who abused the confidence of their too credulous companions, in order to serve their own selfish interests. The character of a spy has been universally held to be hateful throughout the civilized world; nor is there anything in the spirit and services of those employed on this occasion in Ireland, to redeem them from the general infamy attaching to their class.

A judgment scarcely less condemnatory must be passed on the Irish government, which, on a full knowledge of the designs of the United Irishmen, permitted them to continue their organizations, and ultimately hastened the explosion of their treason. Lord Castlereagh had now abandoned the liberal professions which in other days had won him the confidence of his countrymen, and there was nothing too tortuous or base for his apostate mind.

‘Such were the well-timed measures adopted by the Irish government to cause the insurrection, in Lord Castlereagh’s words, ‘to explode,’ when the mischievous designs of the United Irishmen Society had been long known to that government,—and so fully, that one of its leading members declared in parliament, ‘that the state prisoners had confessed nothing which had not been known to them before.’ Why, then, did they not arrest the leaders of the Leinster societies long before, and prevent the insurrection which at length broke out?

‘This policy of allowing a people to go into rebellion, when the leaders of it might have been previously seized, and their plans consequently obstructed and deranged, is one which, in the recent commotion in Upper Canada, has been stigmatized in the British parliament as a proceeding which could not be defended on any grounds. The policy (worthy of Machiavelli) had been acted on, however, by Mr. Pitt so early as 1794, in the case of Jackson, the emissary of the French government, who had been denounced to him by his companion, Cockayne. On Jackson’s arrival in England, Mr. Pitt was informed of his treasonable designs by Cockayne, and yet he suffered the traitor to proceed to Ireland on his mischievous enterprise, accompanied by the informer, to open his mission to the leaders of the United Irishmen Society in that country, and to inveigle the imprudent and unwary persons with whom he was put in communication, into acts of treason.

‘The policy which dictated such a proceeding, truly deserves the worst name that can be given to it. The duty of an enlightened minister in similar circumstances, in these days, would be considered by all parties, to prevent, at the onset, the accomplishment of such designs; and where the violence of political excitement was tending towards sedition, before the heated partizan had precipitated his followers and himself into the guilt of treason, to check his course, instead of accelerating his steps. The process, however, through which the unfortunate country had to pass before a legislative Union could be carried, was not to be interrupted. Two years later, Mr. Harvey M. Morres, a gentleman of rank and a magistrate of the county Tipperary, and then of acknowledged loyalty, wrote to Mr. Secretary Cooke, informing him that the Orange and other factious societies had recently spread into that county, and were productive of mischievous results, which would involve the country in insurrection if they were not suppressed. Mr. Morres expressed his readiness to act in concert with the government in preventing such disorders, and discouraging those societies, which then were exasperating the people. Mr. Secretary Cooke addressed a reply to this gentleman, which could leave no doubt on his mind that the Orange societies were under the especial protection of the government, and the result would be putting the people out of the king’s peace. Mr. Morres was thanked for ‘this proof of his zeal and loyalty,’ but was informed the government saw no reason for acting on his suggestions, or availing itself, in this matter, of his services.’—*Ib.*, 210—212.

It is intimated by Dr. Madden, though we can scarcely give credit to the statement, that treachery was not confined to the

United Irishmen, but that 'in the closets of the most influential friends and agents of government, there existed channels of communication with the leaders of the United Irishmen, by means of which the most important measures of the administration were made known to the Directory, and to others in the confidence of its members, which frequently baffled the designs of government, and disconcerted the plans of the law officers of the crown in the course of the proceedings instituted against the members of this society.' We much doubt whether a more searching inquiry into the facts which are alleged to bear out this representation, would not lead to the conclusion that, in this, as in other well-known cases, the Irish leaders were duped by the plausible professions of government emissaries.

According to the new organization of the society which was completed May 10, 1795, separation from England and a republican government became the fixed, though not at once the avowed object of its leaders. Foreign assistance was deemed needful for the accomplishment of these ends, and France was naturally looked to as the quarter whence it was to be obtained. After the Indemnity and Insurrection Acts were proposed for the adoption of the legislature, and the system of coercion and extermination in the North had received a legal sanction, a meeting of the executive of the association took place in May 1796, when it was determined that as no constitutional means of opposing oppression were available, assistance should be sought from a foreign power. In pursuance of this resolution, Lord Edward Fitzgerald proceeded to the French frontier, and had an interview with General Hoche, with whom he entered into arrangements for the descent of French troops on the Irish coast. To this fearful pass were affairs brought by the unscrupulous tyranny and grinding oppression of the government on the one hand, and the unreflecting and passionate enthusiasm of the Irish leaders on the other. Alive only to the wrongs which had been inflicted by England, they blindly solicited the presence of a French auxiliary, and hazarded all the terrific evils of a civil war. The presence of foreign troops was at first thought indispensable to the success of a popular movement, but when disappointed in this direction, it was madly resolved to rouse an unarmed but infuriated populace against the disciplined troops and steady counsels of England. The sufferings of the Irish had indeed been terrible. No words can paint too darkly the atrocities practised on them. The injustice and oppression to which they had been subjected on the part of several administrations from 1792 to 1798, are set forth in a petition known to be drawn up by Mr. Grattan, and presented to the crown by the Irish Whig Club, as one of its last acts.

'In this admirable document, the recent rebellion is clearly and irrefragably shown to be the result of their measures ; the dishonour brought on both Houses so early as 1792, by the scandalously open, and shamefully avowed sale of the Peerage, to procure seats in the Commons; the people's confidence in parliament destroyed; the unconstitutional nature of the act 33 George the Third, to prevent what was called unlawful assemblies of the people, under pretence of preparing petitions, or other addresses to the crown or the parliament ; the rigour of the gunpowder and convention bills in 1793; the persecutions of the people, on the part of the Orangemen in the north, sanctioned and protected in 1790, by a Bill of Indemnity; the partiality exhibited in the resolutions brought forward in the House of Commons by the attorney-general in that year, as a kind of supplement to his insurrection act, wherein all the disturbances of the four preceding years are ascribed to the Defenders, and not one syllable is mentioned of the atrocities of the Peep-of-day Boys, committed on the people, who, having no protection to look to from the law, were compelled, in self-defence, to resist their exterminators. The suspension of the Habeas Corpus Bill in 1797, the extreme severity of military government, Lord Carhampton's wholesale transportation of the people without trial or legal proof of guilt, General Lake's death-denouncing proclamation, the free quarters in the country, the proscription of the catholics, the burning of their dwellings and their chapels ; and lastly, in a country where female chastity was held in the highest respect, the licentiousness of a military rabble, who, in the words of their commander-in-chief, at a later period, were 'terrible to all except the enemy,' are likewise referred to.'—*Ib.*, pp. 117, 118.

These atrocities might have made out a justifiable reason for revolt, if there had been any rational ground to hope that such revolt could be carried to a successful issue ; but they form no vindication of the rashness of men who plunged their country into the horrors of a civil war, without the slightest possibility of success. The utter hopelessness of the movement is strikingly shown in a conversation reported by Dr. Madden, as having taken place between Lord Fitzgerald and a gentleman whose name is not given, but whose remarks indicate his sound judgment and upright purpose.

'He informed Lord Edward, though he had taken no part for some time in the affairs of the Union, he did not cease to give his opinion when consulted, and especially by Lord Edward—though he was well aware, when once his lordship had made up his mind on a point, he was little influenced by the counsel of any man. When Lord Edward had spoken of his deserting the cause, the latter felt hurt by the observation, and replied in strong terms that he had not deserted the people, nor betrayed their cause, but those people had done so, who had precipitated measures, prematurely taken, which did not afford the least promise of success. 'My lord,' said he, 'I am not a person to desert

a cause in which I have embarked. I knew the dangers of it when I joined it; were those dangers only for myself, or the friends about me, I am not the man to be deterred by the consideration of what may happen to myself or them—we might fall, but the cause might not fail; and, so long as the country was served, it would matter little; but when I know the step that you are taking will involve that cause in the greatest difficulties, my fears are great—I tremble for the result. My lord, all the services that you or your noble house have ever rendered to the country, or ever can render to it, will never make amends to the people for the misery and wretchedness the failure of your present plans will cause them.’ ‘I tell you,’ replied Lord Edward impetuously, ‘the chances of success are greatly in favour of our attempt; examine these returns—here are returns which shew that one hundred thousand armed men may be counted on to take the field.’ ‘My lord,’ replied his friend, ‘it is one thing to have a hundred thousand men on paper, and another in the field. A hundred thousand men on paper will not furnish fifty thousand in array. I, for one, am enrolled amongst the number; but I candidly tell you, you will not find me in your ranks. You know for what objects we joined this Union, and what means we reckoned on for carrying them into effect. Fifteen thousand Frenchmen were considered essential to our undertaking. If they were so at that time, still more so are they now, when our warlike aspect has caused the government to pour troops into the country.’ ‘What!’ said Lord Edward, ‘would you attempt nothing without these fifteen thousand men—would you not be satisfied with ten thousand?’ ‘I would, my lord,’ replied his friend, ‘if the aid of the fifteen could not be procured.’

‘‘But,’ continued Lord Edward, ‘if even the ten could not be got, what would you do then?’

‘‘I would then accept of five, my lord,’ was the reply.

‘‘But,’ said Lord Edward, fixing his eyes with great earnestness on him, ‘we cannot get five thousand, and with respect to the larger force we originally wished for, had we succeeded, with so large a body of French troops, we might have found it difficult enough to get rid of our allies.’ To this it was replied, ‘My lord, if we found it possible to get rid of our enemies, ten times as numerous as our allies, we could have little difficulty in getting rid of the latter when necessity required it.’

‘‘But, I tell you we cannot,’ said Lord Edward, ‘get even the five thousand you speak of, and when you know that we cannot, will you desert our cause? The eyes of the delegates were turned on the person thus addressed. He felt that Lord Edward had put the matter in such a light before those present, that he would have been branded as a traitor if he abandoned the cause, while there was a ray of hope for its success.

‘My lord,’ said he, ‘if five thousand men could not be obtained, I would seek the assistance of a sufficient number of French officers to head our people, and with three hundred of these, perhaps we might be justified in making an effort for independence, but not without them,

What military men have we of our own, to lead our unfortunate people into action against a disciplined army ?

'Lord Edward ridiculed the idea of there being anything like discipline at that time in the English army. 'Besides, the numbers,' he said, 'of the United Irishmen, would more than counterbalance any superiority in the discipline of their enemies.'

'My lord,' said his friend, 'we must not be deceived; they are disciplined, and our people are not; if the latter are repulsed and broken, who is to reform their lines? Once thrown into disorder, the greater their numbers the greater will be the havoc made amongst them.'

'Lord Edward said, 'without risking a general engagement, he would be able to get possession of Dublin.'

'Suppose you did, my lord,' was the reply; 'the possession of the capital would not insure success; and even when you had taken the city, if the citizens asked to see the army of their brave deliverers, which might be encamped in the Phoenix Park, the citizens would naturally expect to see some military evolutions performed, some sort of military array, exhibited on such an occasion. Who would be there, my lord, to put the people through these evolutions? What officers have you to teach them one military manœuvre? and if they were suddenly attacked by an army in the rear, what leader accustomed to the field have you to bring them with any advantage to the attack? You, my lord, are the only military man amongst us, but you cannot be everywhere you are required; and the misfortune is, you delegate your authority to those whom you think are like yourself; but they are not like you, we have no such persons amongst us.'—*Ib.*, pp. 173—176.

Lord Edward himself was soon doomed to experience the soundness of the reasonings urged by his friend. The air of romance which has been thrown around him, has concealed from view the essential defects of his character, considered as a popular leader. He was generous, high-minded, and brave, but was utterly destitute of the cool judgment, political forethought and practical sagacity which his position required. The story of his arrest is well known, but Dr. Madden has furnished an account written by Nicholas Murphy, in whose house the arrest took place, from which we must make an extract.

The misguided patriot came to Murphy's house on the eighteenth of May, 1798, a reward of 1000*l.* having been offered a few days previously for his apprehension. He looked at this time, Murphy tells us, 'very bad and altered from what he appeared when I saw him before.' The writer continues,—

'In the course of the day (Saturday 19th) there was a guard of soldiers, and I believe Major Swan, Major Sirr, a Mr. Medlicot, and another, making a search at Mr. Moore's house, the Yellow Lion, in Thomas-street. A friend came and mentioned the circumstance to me. I immediately mentioned it to Lord Edward, and had him conveyed out of the house and concealed in a valley, on the roof of one of

the warehouses. While I was doing this, Sam. Neilson came and enquired of the girl if I was at home? I believe she said not. 'Bid him be cautious,' I think was what she told me he said. I considered that conduct of his very ill-timed; however, I am led to believe it was well intended. On Saturday morning, the day of the arrest, there came a single rap at the door; I opened it myself, and a woman with a bundle appeared, and enquired if that was Mr. Murphy's? I said it was. She informed me that she came from Mrs. Moore, and was directed to leave that bundle there. I knew not what it contained; but, to my surprise, when I opened it, I found it to be an uniform, of a very beautiful green colour, gimpt or braided down the front, with crimson or rose-colour cuffs and cape; there were two dresses—one a long-skirted coat, vest and pantaloons; the other a short jacket, that came round quite close, and was braided in front; there was also a pair of overalls, that buttoned from the hip to the ankle, with, I think, black Spanish leather on the sides. I suppose they were intended for riding. The bundle contained a cap of a very fanciful description, extremely attractive, formed exactly like a sugar-loaf—that part that went round the forehead green, the upper part crimson, with a large tassel, which inclined on one side or other occasionally when on the head.

'After placing Lord Edward in the valley, on the roof of the warehouse, I came down in a little time and stood at the gate, the soldiers still at Mr. Moore's. I perceived four persons walking in the middle of the street, some of them in uniform; I believe yeomen. I think Major Swan and Captain Medlicot was of the party. Towards four o'clock, Lord Edward came down to dinner; everything was supposed to be still. Now at this time Sam. Neilson came in to see us. Dinner was nearly ready, I asked him to stay and dine, which he accepted. Nothing particular occurred, except speaking on a variety of subjects, when Mr. Neilson, as if something struck him, immediately went away, leaving us together; there was very little wine taken. Lord Edward was very abstemious. In a short time I went out; and now the tragedy commenced. I wished to leave Lord Edward to himself. I was absent I suppose about an hour. I came into the room where we dined, being the back drawing-room, he was not there; I went to the sleeping-room, he was in bed. It was at this time about seven o'clock. I asked him to come down to tea. I was not in the room three minutes, when in came Major Swan, and a person following him in a soldier's jacket, and a sword in his hand; he wore a round hat. When I saw Major Swan, I was thunderstruck. I put myself before him, and asked his business. He looked over me, and saw Lord Edward in the bed. He pushed by me quickly, and Lord Edward seeing him, sprung up instantly like a tiger, and drew a dagger which he carried about him, and wounded Major Swan slightly I believe. Major Swan had a pistol in his waistcoat pocket, which he fired without effect; he immediately turned to me, and gave me a severe thrust of the pistol under the eye, at the same time desiring the person that came in with him, to take me into custody. I was immediately taken

away to the yard, there I saw Major Sirr and about six soldiers of the Dumbarton Fencibles.

‘Major Swan had thought proper to run, as fast as he could, to the street, and I think he never looked behind him till he got out of danger, and he was then parading up and down the flags, exhibiting his linen, which was stained with blood. Mr. Ryan supplied Major Swan’s place; he came in contact with Lord Edward, and was wounded seriously. Major Sirr at that time came up stairs, and keeping at a respectful distance, fired a pistol at Lord Edward in a very deliberate manner, and wounded him in the upper part of the shoulder. Reinforcements coming in, Lord Edward surrendered, after a very hard struggle.’—*Ib.*, pp. 257—260.

Four days afterwards Sheares was apprehended, and the society in which he and Lord Edward had acted so prominent a part may be considered as having received its death blow in their arrest. ‘From the date of its origin, October, 1791,’ remarks Dr. Madden, ‘having existed seven years, whether viewed in its results, the character of its members, or the nature of its proceedings, it may certainly be regarded as a confederacy, which no political or revolutionary society that has gone before it has surpassed in importance, boldness of design, and devotion to its principles, however mistaken they may have been.’ Such was the general course of the society whose annals have been so diligently explored by our author; and we trust that its history will serve as a warning to the friends of Irish liberty in all future times. Though deprived of their leaders, without combination, and to a great extent unarmed, the people broke out into open rebellion, and terrible was the retribution which an infuriated and tyrannical government inflicted. The total loss on both sides, is estimated by Plowden, Moore, Curran, and Barrington, at about 70,000; whilst the deaths which happened from torture, or massacre when no resistance was offered, were more numerous than those which occurred in battle. ‘No quarter,’ remarks the Rev. Mr. Gordon, ‘was given to persons taken prisoners as rebels, with or without arms.’ The use of torture was by no means uncommon, though Lord Castlereagh, with that reckless disregard of truth which constituted one of the features of his character, affirmed that ‘torture was never inflicted in Ireland with the knowledge, authority, or approbation of government.’ The fact was openly avowed and defended by members of the Irish government, by parties engaged in inflicting it, and by their advocates in the Irish parliament. Mr. John Claudius Beresford, the most competent of all men to speak on this subject, declared that ‘it was unmanly to deny torture, as it was notoriously practised;’ whilst Lord Clare, in his place in the upper house, avowed the practice, and defended it on the ground of its

necessity. Such was English justice at the close of the last century : such the circumstances which drove an indignant and sensitive people into rebellion. It was distinctly affirmed by Mr. Emmett, in his examination before a committee of the House of Lords, in reply to the enquiry, What caused the late insurrection ? ' The free quarters, house burnings, tortures, and the military executions in the counties of Kildare, Carlow, and Wicklow,' and it would be difficult to disprove his words. What renders the conduct of the government still more reprehensible is, the ground we have to believe, that the severe measures adopted were designed to drive the people to acts of violence, and thereby to forward Mr. Pitt's scheme of a Union. His policy was understood by the more sagacious and reflecting of the Irish, but their influence did not avail to restrain the rashness of their more impetuous associates. The English minister accomplished his purpose, but the means employed have rendered his memory loathsome to the nation.

In closing our notice of these volumes—the early perusal of which we strongly recommend—we cannot but congratulate our countrymen on the altered state of Ireland since the days to which we have been adverting. Much undoubtedly remains to be effected before the leaven of Orangeism will be wholly extracted from her government ; but the Irish people have learnt the great secret of success, and if they steadily persevere in the exclusive use of moral and constitutional means, there is no one of their wrongs which can remain unredressed, no vestige of political oppression or of ecclesiastical assumption and bigotry which can continue to wound their pride, or to damage their interests. Let them be but faithful to themselves, and to the spirit of their age, eschewing all violence, and confining their efforts within limits strictly constitutional, and no change of administration, no bitterness of spirit or party strife, can long exclude them from a perfect equality with ourselves ; much less enact again such scenes of rapine and murder as were formerly perpetrated under the auspices of Pitt and Castlereagh.

Art. V. *The Philosophy of Necessity ; or, the Law of Consequences, as applicable to Mental, Moral, and Social Science.* By Charles Bray. 2 vols. 8vo. Longman. 1841.

WE frankly confess that the work of which we have given the title, considered by itself, has but slender claims on the attention of our readers, and that we should have left it undisturbed in the obscurity which is its fitting element, but for a desire to give our deliberate protest against the class of shallow and presumptuous publications to which it so manifestly belongs. In utter igno-

rance of the writer, we will venture to surmise that he may be the amiable and clever oracle of some coterie of half-educated readers of pamphlets, and auditors of itinerant lecturers on Phrenology and Socialism, who has gleaned his anatomy from Dr. Southwood Smith; his mental philosophy from Mr. George Combe; his social science from Mr. Robert Owen; and his metaphysics from no very deep perusal of Jonathan Edwards, and of Jeremy Bentham.

The object of the work is sufficiently ambitious; it is to reduce all the grave questions of psychology, ethics, and human happiness, to the absolute dominion of physical necessity. It would be ridiculous to imagine that this writer has bestowed anything like adequate attention on any one of these questions, since the entire structure of his work betrays the absence of nearly all those qualities, attainments, and habits, which are indispensable to success in such studies. By all who have pursued these deeply interesting inquiries in the humble and searching spirit of philosophy, these volumes will be seen, at the first glance, to have been got up without understanding great principles which have been established for ages, and with the vulgar fancy that whatever is dressed in unwonted phraseology is a new and great discovery.

We should have gladly hailed a discussion of the points embraced in these volumes, in which we could have traced the vitality of an original mind in the delicate analysis of theories, or in the impressive statement of facts, even though there might be principles which we must reject as unsound, or results which we could prove to be inconclusive or false. We are friends of free inquiry on all subjects. Our aim is not to serve parties, but to promote knowledge. We are not prone to condemn a writer because we do not approve of all he writes. We have no interest in keeping up an aristocracy in literature. We are tempted rather to foster than to restrain the developments of active intellect, and the intrepidity of honest conviction, in every sphere of life, and under all disadvantages of training. But when we have waded through nearly seven hundred pages of such ill-digested, incongruous, and superficial fallacies as those which abound in these volumes, we cannot conceal our regret that the industry of the writer had not been spent on an undertaking more within his grasp, and more likely to improve the minds and to advance the interests of the few who will have the patience to go through the work. If, as the writer assures us, the views which he has attempted to set forth in these pages have afforded much consolation and satisfaction to his own mind, we can only say, that his need of consolation must have been very slight, and his capacity of satisfaction unenviably small; for one element of those views

is—Materialism, and the other—Fate. Truly sorry are we to find that any man can console himself with such mischievous absurdities, and can fancy, that by their propagation, he may offer grounds of hope and trust to any of his fellow creatures.

To justify the terms which we have employed, it will be requisite merely to examine the writer's views as given by himself, on mind, morals, and social science. In his definitions of mind, there is a mixture of timidity, inconsistency, and rashness, which makes it sufficiently apparent that whilst he knows little of the rudiments of mental science, he cherishes an opinion on the subject, which a reader of moderate intelligence can see, through the changes of language by which he strives to mystify it. At one time, mind is a portion of life, at another time, the abstract sign of the sum of all our sensations; at one time it is the function of the brain, at another, it *is* the brain, for anything the writer knows; and these feeble triflings are uttered with a formality of scientific precision, and a pomp of philosophical language, which, to some readers, may be mistaken for acquaintance with the subject. But the very fact that such varied and even contradictory definitions are given, is itself a proof that the writer has a notion on the nature of mind, which he hesitates to express in plain terms, and which notion is irreconcilable with truth. The whole of what he says, most tediously, on the relation of mind to the bodily organs, may be correct or otherwise, so far as it goes; but the obvious drift of it is to produce the impression that this is all we can know of mind or of its operations.

Now this is thoroughly refuted by every man's consciousness and experience. Every man knows that he thinks, feels, reasons, imagines, chooses, approves, or disapproves of particular actions or habits; and every man knows that all these states of mind are totally different from all the known states of all material bodies. In thus contemplating the order of nature, as her servants and interpreters, it is in our power to collect facts, to arrange and classify them, and by philosophical induction to reach the great principles which pervade these facts and are evolved by them. Thus employed, we are pursuing genuine mental science, and the result of our logical inquiry in this direction is, the philosophy of mind.

On what is now styled phrenology we avail ourselves of this occasion to deliver our judgment—a judgment formed, we can conscientiously aver, by patient, impartial, and often revised examination of its principles and its history. It has been known, in all ages, that the brain and other portions of the bodily fabric are acted on by our thoughts and feelings, and that by some law of reciprocation, these thoughts and feelings are likewise acted on by the brain, and other

portions of the body. It has been equally well known, in nearly all ages of which we have any record, that the healthy state of the brain, especially, and of the bodily functions, generally, is closely connected with the freedom, power, and happiness of the mind. Nor has it escaped the observation of enlightened men, at any time, that mental energy, generally considered, is greatly dependent for its development on a given amount and defined position of certain portions of the brain. In the training of youth, in the treatment of disease, in the arts of painting and sculpture, in the universal impressions of mankind, in the descriptions of poetry, and even in the glittering dreams of fancy, physical developments have ever been associated with intellectual eminence; and even some of the divisions of Gall and Spurzheim it is well known to many of our readers, have been anticipated by medical and other writers long ago. This general fact of the dependence of the mind on the bodily organs has, moreover, given rise to controversies in which some of the subtlest and strongest reasoners of all times and countries have been engaged. By one class this acknowledged fact has been professedly explained by saying, that what are vulgarly called the actings of the mind, are nothing more than the properties of the material substance; and that to speak of the Mind, the Intellect, or the Soul, is a mere conformity to popular usage, which the philosopher knows to be delusive. From such an explanation it was no very forced inference, that as all the laws of matter are fixed, it is a perfect absurdity to regard these particular phenomena as differing from the others; and consequently, that the received notions of morals, religion, immortality, and happiness, must disappear before the light of science.

On the other hand, the same acknowledged fact has been explained by saying that phenomena differing so entirely from those of external nature, must be attributed to a separate order of laws; and that the attempt to simplify the complex natural history of man by ascribing everything to material organization, is not more philosophical than to deny, on logical grounds, the actual existence of material organs. In point of strict reasoning from what we assuredly know, it is confessed by all whose minds have been much disciplined in such studies, that there is immeasurably less proof of the existence of the brain, than there is of the existence of the conscious and active mind.—There is no grosser error, of the kind, than that which is perpetually obtruded on us by the advocates of phrenology, in treating their predecessors in the department of mental philosophy as metaphysicians, reasoning from abstract principles, instead of drawing their philosophy from facts. This error arises partly from ignorance of the great writers in France, Germany, England, and

Scotland, who have poured such beautiful and steady light into this alluring region of inquiry. We cannot resist this conclusion, recollecting as we do, how rapidly the inductive philosophy displaced the fancies of antiquity by the discoveries of psychological truth, long before it unveiled the majesty of nature in the triumphant experiments of physical science. It is true that the term metaphysics has been employed to designate all studies relating to mind as their subject, in contradistinction from those which relate to the conditions and laws of the world around us. But it is very far from being true, that the metaphysical writers of the last two hundred years have treated questions relating to mind, by methods at all differing, in their principle, from those which have conducted the natural philosopher to the magnificent systems of physical astronomy, optics, and chemistry. Although there have been differences of judgment in matters of arrangement or classification, and, as in other sciences, different modes of exhibiting the relation of one fact in mental history to another, there are certain general truths which may be regarded as expressing the collective experience of mankind in the higher functions of their nature. These truths constitute real PHRENOLOGY, or the doctrine of mind. But the modern system for which this title has been claimed, is, in fact, no system of mind at all, *in that respect in which its method of inquiry differs from those which its advocates repudiate.* We think we can make this plain in a few simple sentences. But before doing so, we must briefly set forth the pretensions of this modern phrenology, that we may have before us, within a convenient compass, its points both of agreement and of difference with the philosophy of mind, which it is designed to supersede. Modern phrenology is based on the doctrine of external indications of cerebral development; on the separate functions of distinct portions of the brain, as the specific organs of so many distinct propensities and faculties; and on the presumed existence of original and independent powers. This system professes to ascertain character by manipulation and inspection of the head; and its advocates claim for it the merit of being strictly scientific, in opposition to the previously received mental philosophy,—because it is founded entirely on tangible facts. The agreement of this system with that which it professes to reject, is seen in several particulars.—There is in both the acknowledgment of organs of mind. There is in both a large amount of facts belonging to the history of mind, from which, irrespectively of any attention paid to organization, theories of intellectual capacities and propensities may be framed. And there is in both a running appeal continually made to personal consciousness, and to the remembered or registered experience of the past.—The points of difference between the new and the old

philosophies may be stated as follows:—The old philosophy regards the mind as one; the new regards it as a congeries of separate impulses and forces. The old philosophy admits all that can be proved respecting material organization, but confines its researches to the operations of the unseen power by which that material organization is employed; the new phrenology restricts its attention, so long as it is consistent with itself, to the material organization, and even to one department of it. The old philosophy does not necessarily involve any theory as to the nature of mind, though it is compatible with the belief of its spiritual and immortal nature; the new tends to the belief that the nature of man is not spiritual, and therefore that he does not exist in a state of separation from bodily organs. The old philosophy is independent of any metaphysical doctrines of causation, and is free to amalgamate with whatever may be shewn to be the true philosophy of morals; the new appears to bind its advocates down to one law of physical necessity, and to a view of morals which it is difficult to shield from the reproach of fatalism. The intellectual philosophy contains analogies from which we may conceive of higher spheres of existence, and even of the Father of Spirits; the new phrenology knows nothing, and suggests to many minds the impossibility of knowing anything, beyond the limits of our experience in this world. The old philosophy accords with the hopes of the virtuous, the fears of the guilty, and the longings of all human hearts; the new phrenology reduces these passions and anticipations to the fibres and the fluids which are destroyed by death.—Now what we undertake to shew is, that phrenology so called, is *not a science of mind*, in so far as it differs from the old intellectual philosophy. Even were it granted, that *phrenologists* have enlarged our knowledge of mind, have corrected errors, have brought down science from the heights of speculation to the level of practical life, have improved our language by the graphic beauty and rich combinations of its peculiar terms; all this admitted benefit can be proved to have been gathered, not from the study of the brain,—not from the inspection of the skull, but from those very regions of consciousness and experience, in which the intellectual philosopher is described as wasting his time and strength.

As a method of illustrating the mind by the study of the head, we will venture to say that *phrenology has done nothing*. Phrenologists may have illustrated the mind from other sources, and by other methods, but not by *that method* which they claim as their own, and which they set up as the only guide to truth. It may be that the locality, the size, the activity of the many organs of the brain, are correctly pointed out, and appropriately designated by such *elegant* terms as philo-progenitiveness, mar-

vellousness, inhabitiveness ; but the propensities and powers to which these organs are assigned, were known from the beginning by millions, who never dreamed of cerebral developments ; and they are now ascertained by inquiries as independent of such developments as if they had no existence but in dreams.—In these observations, it will be remarked, we have conceded, for the sake of argument, all that is claimed by modern phrenologists in reference to the science of mind ; and we have done this without pressing the grand objection, that phrenology is materialism, as treated by some of its most distinguished abettors ; whilst those who sincerely attempt to defend it from this charge, are under the necessity of having recourse to reasoning and appeals for which this system, *as such*, makes neither provision nor allowance. It would not be difficult, however, to shew that phrenology is, at the best, a retrogression instead of an advance in mental science ;—that it cramps instead of enlarging the field of inquiry ;—that it degrades rather than ennobles our human nature ;—that it increases errors instead of diminishing them ;—that it misleads instead of guiding us to practical applications of truth ;—and that it substitutes a coarse and clumsy apparatus of words for the free and energetic course of thoughts. What is new in this vaunting pretence to science, may be interesting to the anatomist, and useful to the physician ; but it has no bearing whatever on any of the great relations of intellectual life : it never did, and it never can, throw any light on what all men understand by the operations of the human mind. Its catalogue of faculties, its mapping of organs, its translation of treasured knowledge from the language of polite literature into the uncouth phrases of its own diction, are as barbarous in style, as the system itself is empirical in pretension and inconclusive in reasoning. It is not to the disciples of this school that we look, either for original discovery, or for ingenious illustrations of truths already known. And yet it is from the disciples of this school that the writer of the volumes now before us learns to fulfil the high sounding promise, ‘ to inquire into the nature of the constitution of man ; to ascertain his place in creation, the object of his existence, and the boundaries of his mind !’

There is a passage in the first volume of this work on which it may be desirable to offer some criticism, as it affords a favourable specimen of the writer's powers, and contains opinions which will fully justify what we have already said.

‘ The *soul* (if the term mean anything) is the principle of sensation, which, down to the lowest animal in the scale of creation, is found to depend upon the nervous system ; the nervous system depending upon the vital principle, and the vital principle upon organization. The *mind*, as we have previously stated, is only the aggregate of all the sensations of which a being is conscious ; individuality and unity

being given to it by a form of our own intelligence. What we term perception, conception, memory, imagination, judgment, are only diversified sensations, different in their degree of intensity, and in their character, to the feelings resulting from the action of the propensities and sentiments, but still mere sensations. We are not justified in considering the mind as the *cause* of sensations; for of cause we know nothing but as the invariable antecedent, and the invariable antecedent of these sensations is, as far as we have yet discovered, the action of the brain. Nor are we justified in saying the mind is material, which would be to make the cause and effect the same. All facts, however, justify us in saying that sensation is caused by that which we call material, in the only sense in which we can use the term cause. The fact that the properties of matter are conceived of differently by different individuals, according to their own particular organization, or internal forms of thought, is a clear proof that the only connexion between the mind and the real constitution of objects is one of mere relation; whence it follows that the question of Materialism is an idle question, and one of mere words; it being impossible for man to separate the qualities really belonging to an object, from such qualities as modified by the forms and modes of his own intelligence.'—pp. 143, 144.

'The soul (if the term mean anything), is the principle of sensation.' Our readers will appreciate the insinuation which the writer has thrown in by way of parenthesis. That the vital principle depends on organization, is indeed a favourite doctrine with some modern French physiologists, and has been repeated again and again by their followers and emulators in this country. But this is nothing more than an assumption. It is no more true, than that organization depends upon the vital principle; because, though we are not acquainted with life apart from organization, neither are we acquainted with organization apart from life. The fact is, both these terms are abstractions, of which the concrete is some being which lives, and which has organs. Whether living depends on being organized, or being organized depends upon living, we have no mode of explaining either the one or the other. Principle is a convenient term enough:—only we should take care to remember that the 'principle of life,' in English phraseology, is not always the same thing with what in the same phraseology is meant by 'the soul.' In the Scriptures, for example, the *SOUL* is spoken of as distinct from the body, as subsisting after the death of the body, as the subject of those affections, which are, in other connexions, attributed to the mind. If the mind is only the aggregate of all the sensations of which a being is conscious, *what is that conscious being?* If 'we are not justified in designating the mind as the cause of sensations, because the invariable antecedent of these sensations is, as far as we have discovered, the action of the brain,' how come we to know anything of these sensations? Not by observing the

action of the brain ; for even if that could be done, the observation would end with the action of the brain, and would tell us nothing of the sensation. Yet, in fact, we are conscious of the sensation ; and that which is conscious of the sensation, not the sensation itself, *is* the mind.—We can scarcely conceive of a more flippant and unmeaning observation than that ‘all facts justify us in saying that sensation is caused by that which we call material in the only sense in which we can use the term cause ;’ for—besides the material antecedent,—there is also another *concurring* antecedent, which differs from ‘that which we call material’ in this essential particular, that it is conscious of the sensation, and it is by that consciousness alone that we can know anything of the sensation, or form any opinion of its cause.—‘The question of materialism is an idle question, and one of mere words.’—So ! it is an idle question, then, whether the material brain is or is not an organ of mind ; whether man has or has not a mind acting on and acted on by the material organ ; whether there is any difference between the judgment to be formed of our bodily condition, and the judgment to be formed of our mental character ; whether or not we shall be conscious after the material organization is dissolved in dust !

To show the necessary inconsistency of error, we subjoin a short passage on Consciousness :—

‘The phrenological definition of this term would appear, therefore, to be the most correct. ‘Consciousness,’ says Mr. Combe, ‘means the knowledge which the mind has of its own existence and operations ? In this sense, consciousness belongs to man alone, for though the brutes possess feelings and ideas ; though they are endowed with perception, conception, memory, and a kind of judgment, yet there is not the slightest evidence that they are conscious of such states of mind ; they seem to experience new trains of sensations, and to be impelled by them to action, without having any idea of their existence.’—p. 146.

We are not going to discuss the correctness of this phrenological definition of consciousness, nor the speculation respecting brutes. Correct or not, what has this cited definition to do with *phrenology* ? What is the organ of consciousness ? And, moreover, if the mind be only ‘the aggregate of all the sensations of which a being is conscious,’ who on earth can attach any meaning to the proposition, that the aggregate of all the sensations is conscious of the sensations ? Who is the being that is conscious of these separate sensations ?

We are at a loss to conceive in what sense, consistent with modern phrenology, it is possible to enunciate, to say nothing of explaining, the innumerable facts in the experience of human minds, which are usually spoken of as dependent on association or suggestion. Whatever theory may be held as

to the classification of these suggestions, or the laws of these associations, one plain question is, What is that organ, or condition of organs, in the brain, which can be shown to harmonize with any theory, or with any of the facts which constitute the entire sum of our mental history? It is easy to talk of these things in the stiff language of phrenologists; but what possible light can the doctrines, peculiar to their system, throw upon the facts themselves? Yet the law of association is made to account for 'the mode in which religious belief is generally propagated in all countries; and the feelings constitute with each nation, whether Chinese, Hindoo, Mahomedan, or *Christian*, the *internal evidence* for each religion, whether true or false.' So much, it seems, does this dogmatic writer know of the internal evidence of the Christian religion, and so carefully has he compared it with other creeds! The slightest attention to any known treatise on the Christian evidences might have taught him that the 'internal evidence' is found not in human feelings, but in existing *documents*; and that the difference between the true religion and all false religions, as it regards the feelings, does not consist in the fact, that feelings are excited by it, but in the rational, moral, and benignant *character* of the feelings. A religion which, in proportion as it is understood and believed, produces feelings that accord with the relations of man, that elevate and dignify his conduct, that secure his present, and anticipate his future happiness, can never be confounded by an enlightened and impartial thinker, with the absurd, debasing, and wretched creeds of the Chinese, Hindoos, and Mahomedans.

We cannot pass, without grave animadversion, a passage of most mischievous tendency, betraying an unhappy mixture of conceit and ignorance, on the subject of religious conversion. We tell this writer that a knowledge of the mental constitution, far more profound and philosophical than that which is exhibited in his pages, is possessed by many men, who nevertheless believe, on solid and practical grounds, in those divine and spiritual influences of which he speaks so darkly and so scornfully; and that the affectation of scientific superiority with which he offers to rescue such men from superstition and absurdity, excites in them no other emotions than those which are ever awakened by the contemplation of presumptuous impiety.

We pass on to the department of MORAL SCIENCE. And here we shall not linger long; because there is the same defective method of viewing the question, and the same materializing cast of thought, which pervades the previous division.

Let any reader combine Jonathan Edwards' doctrine of motives with the leading principles of Jeremy Bentham's Deontology, and Mr. George Combe's Moral Philosophy, according to the

phrenologists, and he will have in his possession the substance of Mr. Bray's ethical science. It would be unfair to deny to the writer the merit of diligent compilation, of consecutive thinking, and of perspicuous, and occasionally eloquent, expression, in bringing together the portions of these separate systems; and we confess there is something very ingenious, *if it were not excessively stale*, in reducing all morality to the same invariable order of causation which accounts for the growth of plants, the revolution of the seasons, and the force of gunpowder, or of steam! We are further inclined to think, that not a few of our *unfortunate* fellow-creatures will hear with some degree of satisfaction, that 'responsibility, in the sense in which it is generally used, is without meaning;'—that whatever crime they may have been necessitated to commit, 'if the recurrence could be prevented without any suffering at all, we only do an injustice to the individual in subjecting him to it, since he could not have acted otherwise;'—that, 'granting that all actions are necessary, those of the wicked man could not have been other than they were, under the circumstances in which he was placed;—and the natural consequence of vicious action, being loss of enjoyment, he has already suffered from a great deficiency of happiness in the present state; and—such having been the lot assigned him here—ought he still to be among the most unhappy in another world?'

Of a truth, there is somewhat in this mode of teaching *moral* science from which our judgment turns away with the conviction that it is false; against which our conscience testifies as evil; and which comes as a deathly chill over all the affections in which we find our virtue and our happiness; while we are fully persuaded there is *that* in human nature of which this superficial mechanism takes no cognizance, and for which it provides no guidance. Under the veil of religious phraseology, this writer attempts to hide from his readers,—and not improbably from himself,—all the elements of fatalism, of pantheism, of infidelity, of atheism. With him, morality is acting without any reference to God or to futurity. According to his principles, immortality is merely the perpetuation of the species; God is the soul of the universe; religion is acting according to nature; virtue is the calculation of pains and pleasures; faith is 'the belief that effects will be wrought without a cause;' and man is a mere transient atom on the surface of creation, a mere link in an endless chain. Without directly attacking the great truths of natural and revealed theology, he undermines the first principles of the one, and sets at nought the sanction of the other.

Our readers will be prepared to learn that the *SOCIAL SCIENCE* of this work is nothing more than the carrying out of its phrenological doctrines into a theoretic constitution of society. This is, in

reality, *the* object of the work, to which all the previous discussion has been designed to lead the way. There is a good deal of information, drawn from the well known statistical collections of Maculloch, and Porter, and other writers on kindred topics, respecting the physical and social condition of the masses of the people in this country. Much of this information is of a most humiliating and distressing kind,—all going to show that our present state is charged with great and frightful evils,—preparing the contemplative and benevolent mind for laying eager hold of any means by which the further progress of such evils may be stayed, and which can give a reasonable hope of a better, safer, and happier condition at any time to come. Mr. Bray expresses his dissatisfaction with trade unions and political unions, with chartism, and with the schemes of political reformers for lessening taxation, and for enlarging the freedom of trade; and he leans towards the views lately put forth with great power by Mr. Alison,* on some of the evils engendered by a preponderance of manufacturing population. The advantages of emigration and colonization to those who go out are acknowledged; but the benefit to those who stay at home is shown to be doubtful, because of the easier manner in which the power of machinery gains upon the increase of population.

The hope founded on the spread of education is declared to be fallacious, partly from the physical disqualifications produced by poverty, partly from the absorption of time and energy in labour, and partly from the limited, superficial, and merely intellectual character of the instruction given, which exposes us to the dangers of that ill digested information which may prove to be more terrible than the ignorance of which it has taken the place.

The author's opinions of RELIGION as an element in the improvement of society, are expressed with considerable freedom, and display the results of shrewd, though exceedingly narrow, observation on the state of parties among us. But he has taken no pains, that we can find, to study religion in the authentic and inspired oracles of its truth and authority. He writes with more of the sarcasm of the unbeliever than of the serious and dignified discrimination of the philosopher. He resolves some of the plainest doctrines of Christianity into the jargon of his phrenological speculations. He caricatures the office of the Christian pastor as a 'respectable profession, which is a favourite one on account of its requiring less natural talent, previous study, or mental endowment, than any other (excepting, perhaps, the military); and which, while it ensures a livelihood, and often a

* In his work on Population.

competence, leaves much leisure during six days of the week for other pursuits.' He speaks contemptuously of 'leaving the flock to God's free grace and their own free will.'

He tells us, with calm effrontery, 'that the religious world and its teachings hold that the evils under which we suffer are not remediable, but are a necessary part of man's worldly estate, a doctrine which acts as an effectual drag upon the progress of improvement, by inducing men to suppose any great forward movement to be impossible, and exalted views of man's future condition here, utopian?' Whilst he would have the temples of the land converted into *schools* for the exposition of the *natural, organic*, and moral laws—laws, observe, which *he* regards as altogether independent of religion—he maintains that 'places for public worship, there can properly be none;' and he prefers the 'philosophical non-belief in any personal deity' to what he derides as the practical atheism of the unreflecting church-goer. He would have all worship to be solitary. In one word,—if we can gather any meaning from a series of paragraphs containing much ambitious composition,—he would have SOCIETY WITHOUT CHRISTIANITY. The tone of this part of the work is as decidedly hostile to the spirit of the gospel as that of Payne, or Voltaire, or Volney, or any of the most contemptible infidel authors of that age. Has the writer, indeed, been so unhappy as to know of no house of prayer 'where duties are taught, and consolation administered, the mind instructed, and the heart made better,' . . . '—where the principle of devotion is suggested to every heart, as well by the discourses of good and wise men, as by nature's teachings under the high arched roof of heaven'?—We join honestly with him, or with any other man, in denouncing the indolence of hireling priests, the pretence of religion, the inconsistencies of worshippers, the substitution of forms and ceremonies for piety and benevolence, the heartlessness of the selfish rich towards the suffering poor, and the debasement of religion by superstition, hypocrisy, and secularity; but we can entertain no favourable opinion of that writer's strength of mind, accuracy of judgment, or soundness of feeling, who does not see that Christianity is the appointed regenerator of society, or who, seeing it, can speak of its recorded triumphs over ignorance, sin, and misery, as a failure.

In treating of the causes of the poverty of the working classes, the author observes, with obvious propriety, that they lie deep in the very constitution of society itself; but he traces that constitution, not very skilfully or philosophically, to the operation of the law of property—by which alone the resources of society, in its entire past history, could have been developed. He who has property, must of necessity have power over him who has

none; and the share of benefit which the labouring poor can derive from the wealth of the capitalist, is determined by the number of claimants for employment; whilst that share, in consequence of the increase of competitors, and the advances of machinery, has always a tendency to the lowest point of subsistence. In newly or thinly inhabited countries, there may be long-continued demand for labourers; but in old countries densely inhabited, and rich in machinery, the demand is for subsistence. The evils of poverty being thus traced to the unequal distribution of property,—which, by the way, is a truism, little more than another form of stating the fact that poverty exists,—the grand remedy which is proposed for most of the present disorders of society is,—the establishment of a system in which property shall be held in trust by society for the production of the largest enjoyment to all.

That such a state of society is beautiful in theory, that it would greatly augment physical happiness, that it is therefore, in some respects, to be desired, it is scarcely possible, we should think, to doubt; and we should be sorry to believe that it is either abstractedly impossible, or never likely to be realized by our children in some golden age of love.

The social reform by which the writer of these volumes contemplates the arrival of that blessed state, has no pretensions to originality, and exhibits no very profound acquaintance with human nature. It is, in fact, that of Mr. Robert Owen,—the establishment of joint stock capitals, from the savings of the industrious, and the contributions of the wisely self-interested and the benevolent, under the control of a governor, or of a board of directors, chosen by the members. Such a system is recommended by Mr. Bray as securing physical comforts, and affording facilities for obedience to the physical, organic, and moral laws; and several objections to it, founded on theories of population and produce,—on the necessity of individual motives to exertion,—on the evils of too uniform a character in communities,—on the certainty of competition and its attendant evils still springing up between rival communities,—and on the practical difficulties of carrying the proposed scheme of operation into effect, are coolly met, and ingeniously (we cannot say always successfully) answered; and a normal school for the purpose of testing the practicability of the scheme is suggested. We know not of any objection to such an institution, strong enough to outweigh the precious benefits which would be secured by it, *if it could be permanently carried on*. But we confess that we have no confidence in any system that shall be based on the substitute for intellectual and moral truth which has been unfolded in these volumes.—The notion of property being held in

common, is almost as old as society itself. It was exhibited in the earlier states of Greece, in North and South America, in India, and in Egypt, and in the monastic institutions of the ancient church; and it is still adopted in harmony with Christian principles, in the Oberlin Institute, and in the various settlements of the Moravians. Several colonies of the same character, so far as social community and co-operation are concerned, have been set up from time to time in England, Ireland, France, Germany, Holland, and in the United States of America, some of them combining, and others not, peculiarities of religious opinion with their habits of seclusion. It was one of the many projects cast forth from the boiling cauldron of the French revolution. It figures conspicuously in the speculations of 'Godwin's Political Justice.' It has recently assumed a startling position in the doctrines and institutions of St. Simon, of Fourier, and of Considerant, in France; where very active means are employed for the diffusion of its principles and plans throughout the world. In our own country, the general system on which Mr. Bray's idea of social reform appears to be based, is familiarly known by the designation of Socialism, and is identified with the writings and movements of Mr. Robert Owen. A brief sketch of this gentleman's history, writings, and schemes, with some reflections suggested by them, will appropriately close our present observations.

Mr. Owen, a native of North Wales, having been employed in trade, both in London and in Manchester, joined himself to a company who purchased the cotton mills of Mr. David Dale at New Lanark. At this manufacturing establishment he instituted the first infant school of which we have any knowledge; and for nearly thirty years he carried forward his experiments on the formation of human character on the principles developed in his writings. In 1825 he purchased the property of Harmony, in Indiana (United States), where he set up a preliminary society as a model for communities based on the same principles. This was a failure. Like failure has attended similar attempts in America, Scotland, Ireland, England, Holland, and France, directly or indirectly suggested by Mr. Robert Owen. We have not time to expose the delusive attempt to substitute labour *notes* for money as the representative of value.

Mr. Owen has visited not only the United States, but Mexico, the West Indies, France, Austria, Prussia, Bavaria, Saxony, and the Netherlands. He enjoyed at one time the patronage of the Duke of Kent and of the Duke of Sussex. He is the acknowledged head of the socialists.

This body is now enrolled by Act of Parliament under the *delusive* title of the Rational Religionists, and is most systemati-

cally organized. There are sixty-five branch societies in England and Scotland, including three thousand members, nearly a third of whom are in the London branches. They employed last year eighteen missionaries and paid lecturers, who are stated to have addressed average weekly auditories of ten or twelve thousand persons; and as many as eighteen thousand tracts have been distributed within the space of three months.

Mr. Owen's chief writings are but varied forms of stating and advocating his theory of individual character, and of rational society. His main principle is, 'that the character of an individual is formed *for* him, and not *by* him,'—a principle which Mr. Bray imagines that he has corrected and improved, by saying, 'The mode of stating it is open to objection; the mental and bodily constitution of an individual constitute himself, and these determine his character to a certain extent. It is true, 'himself' is but a link in the chain of causation, and therefore the effect of foregoing causes; but it is the immediate antecedent or cause of his character; therefore 'himself' causes his character,—his character is caused by *himself*.' We do not see that this is any improvement at all: on the contrary, as it is put by Mr. B., it makes bad worse, by setting at still bolder defiance every dictate of consciousness, and every principle of morals.

There are moods of mind in which we should think it a waste of time to trouble ourselves with such feeble schemes for the melioration of society, or with the exposure of opinions which carry their refutation along with them. But we cannot witness the periodical revival of such schemes, and the temporary popularity of such opinions, without feeling ourselves summoned to arouse the more vigorous and united efforts of the wise and good to impregnate the neglected masses of our people with the seeds of virtue and contentment. We English people owe much, both of our strength and of our weakness, to what our German neighbours call *einseitigkeit* (onesidedness), in our views and undertakings. The consequence is, that one man looks for the removal of the ills that threaten the well-being of the community in one direction, another man in another direction; each striving to give prominence, and even exclusiveness, to that which he prefers. On one side we hear of building churches, chapels, colleges, and schools. On another side we are dinned with the call for the ballot and complete suffrage. This man would give large powers to the ecclesiastical establishment; that man would have the establishment dissolved. Now we are told to trust to the omnipotence of education; and presently we are assured that there is nothing for it but cold water. In one quarter our miseries are placed to the account of the corn-laws; in another, to the cupidity of trade. The infidel resolves at all events to

extinguish conscience, and to tear from the heart the fears and hopes that look beyond the grave ; while, in too many instances, the Christian forgets that religion is designed to draw within its circle all the forces of society, and to guide all that is wise and energetic in human agency in subordination to the plans of providence, and in dependence on the promises of grace. For our own part, we would ponder with devout seriousness the splendid and comprehensive maxim of inspiration—‘ Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honourable, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report, where there is any virtue, any praise, *think* on these things.’ We would not despair of the ultimate efficiency of any of the elements of good that gleam like the stars of a brighter sky through the gloom and tempest of society. We see enough in history and in Scripture to assure us of the power and foresight of that presiding Goodness by which the world is governed, and which, sooner or later, will bring out order from confusion, and work up the rudiments of transient evil into general and permanent good. Whilst our ultimate reliance is placed on God, we look for the accomplishment of his vast and blessed purposes to the humble, conscientious, united, and persevering activity of believing men. Let us who are Christians take enlarged and practical views of our personal and social responsibility, of our powers and our position, of our duties and of our hopes ; let us transmit to the coming generation the precious inheritance of noble principles nobly exemplified ; and let us seek to be remembered by those who shall come after us, as men who could not rest, who would not despond, and who died in the calm and bright anticipation of beholding from on high the final triumphs of truth over falsehood, and of virtue over vice, in the widely spread dominion of the Prince of Peace. This is philosophy—patriotism—philanthropy, enlightened by eternal truth, and reposing on the throne of God.

Through what changes and revolutions the great social system of humanity must pass in its slow, but certain progress to that glorious consummation, it is difficult to forecast. If we may reason from what has been to that which will be, seeds are scattered in one generation, which, after lodging in the fissures of the rock that frowns over all that is good and free and happy, gather strength from every dew-drop, and from every sunbeam, till at length they tear it from its seat. So far as we are able to interpret the mystic symbols of prophetic vision, we seem warranted to think, that principles, passions, interests, now in operation, will acquire resistless force in future ages ; and hoary systems of belief and of government, which have filled the earth

with tears and lamentations, shall fade as the troubled dreams of night before the cheerful smiles of the morning. And all we know of the inherent energies of Christianity as a scheme uniting truth with love and power, assures us that the day is appointed, and is hastening on with the majesty and certainty of nature's laws, when man shall see in her revelations, and shall feel in her embrace, the destruction of every error that misled him, of every power that oppressed him, of every misery that tortured him; with the fruition of all the good his fancy ever painted, and all the dignity, and security, and joy, for which his heart had ever pined. Such are our hopes when we review the history, and then anticipate the prospects, of our mysterious world. These are hopes which we trust are becoming more and more familiar to the most intelligent and the most active members of the human family; and we would do our best to spread them from mind to mind, and from nation to nation, till, by acquiring the firmness of a conviction that never falters, and the strength of an impulse that never tires, they realize their own fulfilment in the solid and imperishable happiness of socialized and saved humanity.

ART. VI. *History of the Secession Church.* By the Rev. John M'Kerrow, Bridge of Teith. Revised and enlarged edition. Glasgow, 1841.

THE churches of Britain are much less known to one another than an intelligent Christian stranger could readily believe. In all quarters of our island, well informed individuals are to be found, whose tastes have led them to the study of ecclesiastical affairs, modern as well as ancient, or who, by correspondence or travelling, have had much intercourse with Christians of various denominations, and by such means have amassed a stock of knowledge, from which others derive occasional supplies; but, generally speaking, a modern British Christian is quite in the dark about the condition of his neighbours. Smart pupils in our academies and colleges know far more of the institutions of ancient empires, the senate and forum, the consuls and emperors of Rome, the kings of Sparta, and the archons of Athens, and even the Pharaohs and Ptolemys of old Egypt, than of the ecclesiastical affairs of their own land. An exception cannot be made in favour of our ecclesiastical establishments, relatively to each other. By presbyterians, the English church is chiefly known as a great hierarchy, distinguished by an exalted order, living in palaces, worshipping in cathedral fanes, and 'lifting up mitred heads before kings and parliaments;' but the machinery and

operations of the episcopacy, its universities and their affairs, its ordination, baptism, confirmation, eucharist, its bishops' courts, Arches' courts, consistorial courts, advowsons, and the innumerable *et ceteras* of the Anglican mystery, are greatly veiled from presbyterian eyes. We suspect equal ignorance may be predicated of episcopalian minds, relatively to the presbyterian establishment of the north, which has, indeed, succeeded in attracting abundance of attention of late years, yet without diffusing any very palpable or exact information respecting itself among its English neighbours. The homely expression of one of the correspondents of Sir George Sinclair probably indicates, with sufficient fidelity, the measure of satisfaction which many an inquiring episcopalian has arrived at, after attempting to catch a glimpse of presbyteries, synods, assemblies, commissions, anti-patronage, non-intrusion, spiritual independence, veto, and those many other ecclesiastical phantasms which have been flitting, like *borealis*, before the public eye—Sir George's friend protests, 'it is quite a worry.'

The dissenting churches, we believe, are better known to one another; yet the same remark is, to a considerable extent, applicable to them. Notwithstanding the frequent and advantageous intercommuning which their equality of position, their free usages, their local and general benevolent associations,—above all, their common faith, and, it is to be hoped, their growing charity,—all contribute to produce, it is not a little mortifying to discover how slightly brethren are known to brethren, churches to one another. Distance augments this ignorance. The history and present state of that excellent body of men to whom Wales is so deeply indebted for the piety that has spread among her people, the Welsh Methodists, are little known even in England, and our Welsh brethren know little more of us. We believe that the remark is pre-eminently applicable to the dissenters in the northern and southern divisions of the kingdom. The reading northerners, perhaps, know more of us than we of them; but we are aware that many well-informed Scotch dissenters find themselves in a region of discovery when they visit the churches of the south; while most of us have to own that the department of northern dissent is still to us a *terra incognita*.

This mutual ignorance is, in every view, to be regretted, and it is to be hoped that it will soon be chased away; for we may affirm, that the more the evangelical churches of this country are known to one another (especially the evangelical dissenting churches), the more they will be recognised as children of the same family, having a hearty coincidence of sentiment in the great doctrines of religion, distinguished by common trials,

struggles, and successes, and altogether prepared, by the circumstances of their past experience and their present position, to sympathize with one another, for the promotion of vital godliness among themselves, and diffusing it over the land, and throughout the world; perhaps, also, to sustain one another in perilous times not remote.

The volume before us is the production of a highly gifted minister of the United Secession church, containing an historical account of that body from its rise to the present times. The work reflects much credit on its author, showing us, as it everywhere does, extensive reading, great patience of research, luminous arrangement and diction, candour and gentleness of spirit, and a happy combination of conscientious adherence to principle with Christian forbearance and liberality to those who differ. From the subject of this volume, and its style of execution, we have no doubt that it will form a standard work in the department of local ecclesiastical literature. Although first published only three years ago, it has already passed into a second edition.

To the friends of evangelical dissent, it is very cheering to observe the rapid progress of most of the dissenting churches. It is but lately that the centenary of the Wesleyan body was celebrated; and probably in that body alone the number of communicants is more than double that of the Episcopalian communicants in England, Wales, and Ireland. The Welsh Methodists have probably increased in as great a ratio in that principality. The increase of the Baptist and Independent churches in England has also been very great. The same gratifying fact appears in the history of the United Secession church.

Until the period of the secession, there were few dissenters in Scotland. On the restoration of Charles II., episcopacy became the established religion, and the presbyterians were subject to much harassment, and even to sanguinary persecution. At the Revolution, presbytery was re-established; and such was the undue laxity of the General Assembly immediately after the Revolution settlement, that although the episcopalian clergy had, for the most part, distinguished themselves by their intolerance of spirit, not less than by their errors in creed and conduct, they were received into the communion of the presbyterian church, and allowed to hold their livings '*in hundreds*.' A good many of the episcopalian ministers held out, however,—retained in various places small congregations, under the patronage of non-conforming members of the aristocracy,—and formed the chief class of Scottish dissenters for many years. A very few others, very differently minded from the episcopalians, were offended with the unsatisfactory state of things in the national church, and

kept aloof from its communion ; but, prior to the commencement of the secession, there was no other organized separation from the national church.

Many causes prepared the way for the secession, but the proximate cause was the extreme violence of the church in the matter of patronage, in inducting the most obnoxious persons appointed by the patrons, even when their induction was vehemently opposed by the entire body of the parishioners. Those who could accept the sacred office and the cure of souls in such circumstances, were, for the most part, utterly unqualified for their vocation, as far as scriptural piety is concerned ; so that the anti-patronage struggle of that period was not only a conflict for Christian liberty, but for a pure, pious, and efficient Christian ministry, and thus for the spiritual and eternal interest of the souls of men. Such was the indecent and reckless tyranny with which the presbyters of those days acted, that the induction of professed ministers of the gospel of peace often resembled the capture of a military post in some hostile country, and, in some instances, was actually effected by military violence. The General Assembly having shewn their determination to uphold patronage in its rigour, to crush the spirit of resistance in the people, to prevent ministers, either in the church courts or in their pulpits, from testifying against this ecclesiastical tyranny, and thus to secure the induction into the parishes of the whole church of a servile and secular priesthood, Ebenezer Erskine, inspired with a holy zeal for Christian truth, purity, and freedom, set church authority at defiance, and, in a sermon at the opening of the synod of Perth and Stirling, in October, 1732, lifted up his voice in favour of the truth ; the results of which were, his accusation by the synod, his intrepid, honest, and resistless defences, the carrying of his cause to the Assembly, by whom, through the medium of their commission, after much and protracted litigation, which excited the whole church, Mr. Erskine, and three ministers who adhered to him, were suspended from the functions of the ministry, dismissed from the congregations of which they were pastors, and excluded from the national church. To these sentences the four brethren refused to submit, formed themselves into a presbytery in December, 1733, and thus laid the foundation of the church of the secession.

To what extent has this church, originally so small, now spread ? As has just been stated, the number of its ministers was but four at its commencement ; they now amount to 357. The increase has been remarkably constant, and, as shewing that a fair proportion of it has been recent, the following facts may be noticed :—About fourteen years after the commencement of the secession, the seceders unhappily divided into two parties, in

consequence of disputes connected with certain oaths imposed in some towns on admission to their municipal privileges; one party regarding these oaths as inconsistent with their profession as seceders, the other party holding that they might be taken by their members with perfect consistency and integrity. At the time of this unwise division, the number of ministers had increased to forty-two, and the congregations were still more numerous. These two parties of seceders, though maintaining each a separate communion, were cordially one in the faith of Christian truth, and in their observance of Christian worship and of ecclesiastical order; their desire for re-union revived, and, after much joint conference and prayer, their union was happily effected in 1820, when the number of their ministers had grown to 262. Since that period, the number has been augmented by nearly one hundred, the largest increase which, in any equal space, the secession church has ever realized. It appears that in 1839 there were 361 congregations, containing 126,070 members in full communion. The Sabbath schools, and classes under ministerial superintendence, were 716, and the number of pupils 37,612.

In estimating the increase of seceders, it is proper to add, that the above statistical statement is exclusive of minor but highly respectable seceding churches, unconnected with the united secession, amounting to about fifty congregations. Beside these, too, there is the reformed presbyterian church, which has from thirty to forty congregations in Scotland; and, above all, the relief church, now in correspondence, with a view to union, with the united secession, and containing nearly 120 congregations, many of which are among the largest of any denomination in the country.

The *doctrine* of the secession church is Calvinistic, and its *worship* similar, in nearly all respects, to that of the English evangelical dissenters; its *government* is presbyterian—that is, vested in the office-bearers, by whom the admission and exclusion of members, and the general superintendence of the church, are exercised. The office-bearers are chosen by the suffrages of all the communicants, male and female. Candidates for the ministry must first attend some one of the Scottish universities for four sessions, for the study of languages, logic, mathematics, and moral and natural philosophy; and during this preparatory course they enjoy the superintendence of some ministers, specially appointed to watch over their studies. Before their formal admission to the study of divinity, they undergo an examination by the presbytery on their literary and philosophical qualifications, and their religious character and habits; and are then placed for five short sessions, in as many successive

years, in the theological seminary, in which there are four professors, who deliver lectures and prescribe exercises to the students on systematic theology, biblical criticism, biblical interpretation, and pastoral theology. This *curriculum* being finished, the students are subjected to fresh examinations before the presbyteries to which they belong, and have various discourses assigned them for trial, and, if found qualified, receive licence to preach the gospel as probationers for the holy ministry. On receiving a call, or invitation, from any church to become its pastor, they are again examined by the presbytery, and have other trial discourses assigned to them; and if these are sustained, they are set apart to the sacred office with prayer, and the laying on of the hands of the presbytery.

From its commencement, the secession church may be regarded as essentially *missionary*. Necessarily, indeed, it was a home mission, self-supported; the expenses connected with the first introduction of the secession into any place being generally provided for from the joint contributions of the churches; and afterwards, the strong supported the weak. By the blessing of God on such exertions, it has spread itself over a great proportion of the country, very often, as may be supposed, in the face of much and harassing opposition; and even its opponents have long admitted that the spiritual labours of its ministers, and the holy character and influence of many of its members, have been the means of preserving and promoting vital religion, of nursing the great principles of civil and ecclesiastical liberty, and of stirring the long dormant energies of the national church. The Orkney Islands, containing a poor and scattered population, in a most ungenial climate, may be selected as a favourable specimen of a secession home-mission. Although these islands had long been divided into parishes, and had their pastors connected with the established church, they were precisely in such circumstances as many a rural district in England has long been, with similar privileges. They were sitting in darkness, and in the region of the shadow of death. The seceding missionaries first visited Orkney in 1795, and it pleased God to bless their labours to such an extent, that there are now in that small group of islands twelve churches, containing about four thousand persons in full communion. These churches are not only self-sustained, but, considering their means, contribute liberally to the cause of missions, both domestic and foreign, their joint missionary contributions in 1841 exceeding 500*l*. As illustrating the state of piety in these interesting churches, it appears that there are among them weekly meetings for private conference and prayer to the number of two hundred and sixty, attended by from eighteen hundred to two thousand persons. These Orcadian wastes have thus become *Hephzibah and Beulah*.

The missionary efforts of the seceders were not, however, limited to their own country. Ireland first attracted their regards, and the foundations of many churches were speedily laid in that island. And so far back as the middle of the last century, they began to send their missionaries to the United States, and subsequently to Nova Scotia. In the former territory, whole associations of churches owe their origin to seceding missionaries; and the existing synod of Nova Scotia, including twenty ministers and more churches, is an off-shoot from the Scotch secession. They have, besides, not only cordially co-operated with the great missionary, bible, and tract societies of England, but have more recently planted missionary churches in Jamaica, where they have six ordained missionaries, besides catechists—in Trinidad, where they have two missionaries—and in Canada, where they have twenty-one, occupying about fifty churches and stations. In addition to all these, they have one on the continent of Europe, and one in Persia.

The society has been blessed with a succession of laborious, faithful, godly, and in many instances, distinguished men, in the ministry. Among the latter (to overlook altogether the living race) may be named the two Erskines, Fisher, Wilson, and Moncrieff, their early coadjutors, the Browns, Bruce, Paxton, Drs. Jamieson and M'Crie, and the late Dr. Dick. These are sufficient to reflect sacred lustre on any church; and their names are extensively held in affectionate veneration.

The seceders in Scotland were *voluntary* in fact, long before they became voluntary in principle. They seem never to have doubted that it is the duty, and even the privilege of Christians, to make pecuniary provision, by their free-will offerings, for maintaining and propagating the ordinances of Christ; but educated as they were in an established church, holding ecclesiastical documents, in which power over the church of Christ is expressly conceded to the civil magistrate, and being long and intensely occupied with other questions, it was not till towards the close of the last century that 'the magistrate's power,' both *circa sacra*, and *in sacris*, came to be closely examined by the seceders. In consequence of discussions and decisions on this subject, a few good men left the communion of both bodies of the secession, and formed separate churches, among whom was the late Dr. M'Crie. Since that period, a flood of light has been poured on all questions connected with Christian liberty, and the vast evils which spring from the ill-fated union of church and state; and now, with very few exceptions, the Scottish seceders are voluntaries to the core.

These brief notices of the secession church might receive ample illustration from the valuable volume before us. But we must now content ourselves with presenting to our readers some

specimens of the style and manner of the author. The following is Mr. M'Kerrow's description of the state of ecclesiastical affairs in Scotland, immediately before the secession:—

‘The state of affairs in the national church at this period, even its greatest admirers must admit, was deplorably bad. The people groaned under the yoke of patronage, and in vain did they apply for relief to the ecclesiastical rulers. These, so far from listening to their complaints, or sympathizing with them, seemed resolved to carry matters with a high hand. The violent intrusion of ministers upon reclaiming congregations prevailed in every part of the country. At every meeting of the assembly, for several successive years, no small portion of their business consisted in considering cases of appeal, that were occasioned by the attempt to impose ministers upon parishes in opposition to the wishes of the people. In the journal of the assembly's proceedings for 1730, there are recorded no fewer than *twelve* cases of this description. The mentioning of this fact may serve to give my readers some idea of the agitated state of the country at the time immediately preceding the commencement of the secession. Some of these cases were protracted from one assembly to another; and during the time that they were thus kept in dependence, the minds of the people were kept in a state of the greatest excitement. In certain instances the presbyteries and synods were inclined to support the claims of the people, but when their cause came to be discussed at the bar of the assembly, or when it was referred by the assembly to the commission, their appeal was almost uniformly unsuccessful.

‘The policy pursued by those who took the lead in the church courts at this period, obviously tended to establish a species of ecclesiastical despotism, in the exercise of which they might give effect to the law of patronage, and crush the doctrine of popular election, so keenly contended for by the people, and by a considerable portion of the ministers. Complaints were made that the commission, in certain instances, sustained calls which had been attested merely by a notary public, without any moderation having taken place by appointment of presbytery. The powers exercised by the commission were of an arbitrary and odious kind; they reversed the sentences of synods, even though their number might be inferior to that of the synod whose sentence was reversed; and they censured presbyteries and synods for testifying their displeasure against those ministers who accepted of presentations. The assembly occasionally found fault with the commission, for having exceeded the power entrusted to them; but it was remarked, that though they censured them, they seldom, if ever, reversed their objectionable proceedings. In certain cases, where the people proved refractory, and where the presbytery was resolved to grant induction to an unpopular candidate, an armed force was employed to carry into effect the decisions of the church courts; and the unseemly spectacle was now and then exhibited of the ministers of religion being guarded to church upon a sabbath by files of dragoons, amid the noise of drums and the flashing of swords, that they might serve the edict of an hireling, to whose ministry the people were re-

solved not to submit. A writer of that day gives the following account of a scene of this kind which took place at Bathgate, at the serving of the edict of Mr. Thomas Laurie, by appointment of the presbytery of Linlithgow:—‘These and such like things were done to terrify the people; and yet, for all that, these gentlemen and the two ministers that were to serve the edict, being conscious to themselves of the badness of their cause, and what an evil part they were acting, thought not fit to do it until they got a troop of dragoons to be a guard to them; and accordingly, November 17, 1717, being the Sabbath-day, they came to Bathgate, and when approaching the town, they caused to beat their drum, and draw their swords, and in this posture came through the town, guarding the ministers into the church, riding, and striking with their naked swords at the women and others standing and gazing upon the way side, which was a melancholy sabbath in Bathgate, the sabbath-day being much profaned, not only by the people of the place, but by many coming from other parishes, to see a new way of propagating the gospel by red-coat booted apostles officiating as elders.

‘By such arbitrary proceedings as these, the minds of the people, and of not a few of the ministers, were much irritated; and that a revolt should ere long take place against the misgovernment of rulers, who showed such a total disregard of the feelings of those whose spiritual interests they were bound to promote, was nothing more than might have been expected. In looking back to the transactions of that period, instead of wondering that so many excellent men left the pale of the establishment when the secession commenced, our only surprise is, that they continued so long to abide in her communion. No measures could have been adopted that were better fitted for secularizing the Scottish church, than those which the dominant party, in her ecclesiastical courts, actually pursued. That this was the object which they had in view in adopting these measures, I shall not take upon me to affirm, but that this was the decided tendency of the course which they pursued, is sufficiently obvious. In conducting their administration, they were guided more by the dictates of worldly policy than by the maxims of Scripture; when argument failed in silencing objections, they employed force; and when men could not be induced, by persuasion, to submit to their arbitrary enactments, they had recourse to terror. Armed with the authority of the state, as well as of the church, they aimed at bearing down all opposition, by occasionally calling into their aid the strong arm of the law. That men should tamely submit, for any length of time, to have their feelings outraged, their rights trampled upon, and their complaints disregarded, without making any effort to emancipate themselves from the tyranny which subjects them to such wrongs, is what we have no reason to expect from human nature. Those who are oppressed will take the first opportunity that presents itself of breaking the yoke from their necks, and having burst asunder their fetters, will dash them in the faces of their oppressors. My readers, after perusing the preceding statements, will not be surprised to be told that the minds of a considerable portion

of the people in Scotland were alienated, by the transactions referred to, from their ecclesiastical rulers; and that no sooner was a way of escape opened up to them from the grievous trammels to which they were subjected, than multitudes eagerly availed themselves of it. This way of escape was opened up by the secession which took place from the national church—an event which, though greatly deplored at first, has been productive of essential benefit to the country, and is every day spreading its blessings wider and wider. I cannot but regard it as a merciful interposition of Providence, on behalf of our land, that the secession church sprung into existence at the time it did, seeing that it has been honoured of God as an instrument for maintaining, in an eminent degree, sound doctrine, purity of discipline, and religious liberty, in this northern part of the island; seeing that, from first to last, many thousands of pious Christians have found a quiet retreat in its bosom from the evils of patronage, and from the other grievances complained of in the establishment; and seeing that, by means of the reflex influence which it has exercised upon the national church, it has considerably checked it in its progress of deterioration, and rendered it, in some respects, more efficient.’—p. 33.

‘The extract we have given is taken from the ‘introductory narrative,’ which is replete with valuable information, succinctly and gravely related. The next chapter possesses uncommon interest, carrying us into the very midst of the events and the agents by which this era in Scottish ecclesiastical history was signalized; and by the whole character and bearing of Erskine, and his little group of friends, their calmness, their faithfulness, their wisdom, their humility, their steadfast faith, their profound piety, their bold and intrepid decision, which neither the entreaties of timid friends, nor the menaces and fulminations of powerful opponents could for a moment shake,—in a word, their unsought and unostentatious dignity,—we are led back to the reformers and martyrs of other days, and we recognise the gracious agency of Him who qualifies his chosen servants for the duties and conflicts of any emergency to which he calls them, ever mindful of his promise, ‘so I am with you always.’

Patronage produced the secession. By Scottish law it is provided, that when a patron neglects or refuses to *present* (appoint) to a vacant living for six months after it has become vacant, the right of *presenting* (appointing) belongs to the presbytery (*jus devolutum*). The Assembly set themselves to legislate respecting this power of presbyteries. Had they favoured popular election, they would at once have decided that the presbyteries, in such cases, should give to the church members the unfettered right of election. But in place of this, they passed a law, by which the magistrates, town council, and elders, in royal burghs, and protestant heritors (proprietors) and elders, in rural parishes, should elect the minister, who might be either ‘approved or disapproved’

by the congregation. If the congregation disapproved, the reasons of their disapprobation were to be laid before the presbytery, 'by whose determination the calling and entry of the minister should be concluded according to the rules of the church.' Against this decision Mr. Erskine, with others, protested; but the Assembly, with sovereign authority, refused to record the protest. The following passage narrates the results:—

'The situation of the faithful ministers of the church of Scotland was, at this time, sufficiently distressing. They had the mortification to behold measures which they considered unscriptural and oppressive carried by triumphant majorities. Against these measures in vain did they remonstrate and petition; their remonstrances were not listened to, and their petitions were disregarded. They were even denied the common privilege of having their dissent or protest marked, in cases when they felt their consciences materially aggrieved; nay, so high did the predominant party stretch their authority, and so imperious was the tone which they assumed, that, in certain instances, the commission were enjoined to summon before them, and to rebuke those persons who should offer a protest, and the presbytery who should receive it. Beyond this, ecclesiastical despotism had but one step further to advance,—and that was to impose restraint upon ministerial faithfulness in the pulpit. Here also it endeavoured to carry its terrors, and it was the foolish attempt to do so, that led directly to the secession.

'Those ministers who belonged to the popular party, considered it their duty to testify from the pulpit against the measures which they deemed injurious to the interests of religion, but which they had not sufficient influence to prevent from being carried in the church courts. This was a privilege which the ministers of Scotland had long claimed and enjoyed; and though, certainly, like every other privilege, it is liable to be abused, and requires much delicacy and judgment to use it aright, yet there can be no doubt that, in some of the past periods of our history, the exercise of it by faithful ministers has been productive of much benefit both to the church and to the country. And if any period can be mentioned in which ministerial freedom, in this respect, was more allowable than at another, that period was the one to which this part of my narrative refers. The ruling party in the church courts thought otherwise; and, as they had previously declared, by an arbitrary enactment, that no protest should be received or recorded against any measure they might be pleased to adopt, however unconstitutional in itself or hurtful in its tendency, so they were resolved to stretch forth the rod of their authority, with the view of preventing their opponents from exposing their unscriptural proceedings in the ministrations of the pulpit. Such a practice as this could not but be galling to them, and it was natural for them to endeavour to suppress it. For this purpose, it was necessary that an example should be made of one of the most influential, as well as most obnoxious, of their opponents; so that, by the censure inflicted, others might be deterred from pursuing a similar course.

‘The individual whom they fixed upon for the purpose of making this experiment, was Mr. Ebenezer Erskine, one of the ministers of Stirling. This person ranked high as a faithful, laborious, and successful preacher of the gospel. The talents which he possessed were of the most popular description; his influence was great, and he was not more distinguished for the clear evangelical views which he had of the truth, than for the fearless manner in which he avowed them, and for his intrepidity in defending them. He was beloved and revered by the people, and he was looked up to with respect by an extensive circle of friends in the ministry. In all the questions which had been brought before the Assembly, involving in them the interests of the truth and the scriptural rights of the people, he had, from his first entrance into the ministry, uniformly espoused the popular side, and had ever shown himself a keen opponent of the secularizing and arbitrary measures pursued by the court party. He had taken an active part in the Marrow controversy; and, in the process carried on against Professor Simson, he had done what he could to strengthen the hands of those who were contending for the truth. Repeatedly had the shafts of calumny been directed against him, with the view of injuring his character, and destroying his usefulness. Already had he, when a minister in Fife, been accused, first before the Synod, and next before the commission of the General Assembly, of teaching doctrines inconsistent with the Confession of Faith, by which his accusers meant the obnoxious doctrines of the Marrow.

‘That a person of Mr. Erskine’s character and influence should be obnoxious to those who could not brook opposition to their measures, and that they should be desirous of an opportunity to check his boldness, was natural. Such an opportunity was furnished by a sermon which he preached at Perth, at the opening of the Synod of Perth and Stirling, on the 10th October, 1732. The subject of his discourse was Psalm cxviii. 22, ‘The stone which the builders refused is become the head stone of the corner.’ In this discourse, Mr. Erskine, when describing the wicked conduct of the Jewish priests and rulers during the period of Christ’s personal ministry, made some pointed allusions to the late transactions of the General Assembly, and to the state of affairs in general throughout the Scottish church, at the same time, his statements were so carefully guarded, that there was nothing personal in them, but each individual of his hearers was left to make an application of them to his own conscience. The sermon, which has long been before the public, contains in it no uncommon display of talent, but it is chiefly distinguished as being a clear, faithful, and practical exposition of the text, and by its peculiar appropriateness to the circumstances in which it was preached.’—p. 42, New Edition.

We must restrict ourselves to these extracts; suffice it to say, that the narrative advances in well-sustained interest as the plot thickens, until the final results, the expulsion of Mr. Erskine and his associates, and the formal institution of the secession church are brought out. These extracts afford examples of the

small *errata* of the author, on which we should feel disposed to animadvert. A phrase occasionally recurs, in rather close succession, even when it is not the most tasteful imaginable; thus, —‘No sooner was a *way of escape opened up to them*, than multitudes eagerly availed themselves of it. *This way of escape was opened up to them* by the secession.’ Some of his tropes might be improved somewhat. ‘Those who are oppressed, having burst asunder their fetters, *will dash them in the faces of their oppressors.*’ Not a few of the ecclesiastical phrases which he uses require a glossary in the south, such as ‘*serving an edict,*’ ‘*moderating in a call,*’ &c. And perhaps, there is more than enough of general remark and discussion to be altogether in keeping with narrative. Upon the whole, however, we welcome this work as a valuable addition to our national stock of ecclesiastical *memorabilia*.

Patronage has thus, then, produced one secession in Scotland: *is it destined to produce another?* A large majority of the General Assembly have solemnly condemned patronage at their last meeting! What, then, is to be done? Can they henceforth ever have to do with patronage? Common minds would say no, unless, after having condemned patronage, they have resolved next to condemn themselves. They set at nought the interdicts of judges; how can they honour the presentations of patrons? If they accept a presentation, or take a living on the ground of one; if they refuse to allow a congregation to elect, until it has first seemed good to the patron to appoint; if they concede to the patron the power he claims, after having solemnly, in the name of Christ, denounced the right and power he holds, the value of the decision will be neutralized by the inconsistency of its authors. *But it will be so neutralized.* The church distinguishes, conveniently enough, betwixt what it may *bear*, and what it may *sanction*; it knows the state will preserve patronage, and, rather than dissolve the loved union, it will *bear*—it will do more, it will accept, it will recognise, it will live by patronage, and will content itself with a *protest* against the grievance! The wedded mates may scold one another, but the state has no wish to part with the church, and the church has declared she has none to part with the state (on the score of patronage, at least); so there will be no divorce with consent of either party, till some more potent third party appear, and finally dissolve the union. Oh that, for the sake of all that is great and good in human character, some at least may catch the spirit of the first seceders, and come forth nobly without the camp, bearing Christ's reproach!

Art. VII. *Norway and her Laplanders in 1841: with a few hints to the Salmon fisher.* By John Milford. 8vo. London: Murray.

THE facilities afforded by railroads and steam-boats have greatly widened the peregrinations of modern tourists. The high road of European travelling having become familiar, and therefore distasteful, attempts are being made to break up new ground on every hand. Our adventurous countrymen are pushing out their rambles in all directions with an activity and enterprise which may well astonish some of our sluggish neighbours. To this we have no objection; but on the contrary, are gratified by the reports brought us from time to time of the habits, condition, and prospects of various tribes, of whom little was previously known. Until very recently, Norway might have been deemed *terra incognita*, but is now in a fair way of becoming as familiar to us as Switzerland, Italy, or Germany. Mr. Laing's volume has done much to effect this, and the one now before us, *haud passibus æquis*, follows in the same direction. The motives which induced Mr. Milford to select Norway as the scene of his excursion, were of 'a private and painful nature.' A heavy sorrow, the nature of which it is not difficult to guess, had beclouded his home, and he sought relief to an overburthened mind and shattered nerves in change of scene and the excitement of travelling. 'I selected Norway,' he tells us, 'as partaking more of nature, fresh and unsophisticated, than those polished and luxurious countries which are more usually resorted to.' He left Hull, accompanied by his son, on Saturday, the 24th of July, 1841, and anchored in the harbour of Christiansand on the morning of the 27th, after a passage of sixty-two hours. The scenery of the coast was not so bold as he had expected, and was certainly less grand than the North of Spain, which Mr. Milford had previously visited. It was, however, 'strikingly beautiful, being indented with bays, and fringed with small rocky islands, and was picturesque, although bare of vegetation.'

The city is not visible from a distance, being concealed by a projecting rock. The houses here are built of wood, and have in general a neat and clean appearance.

'The streets of Christiansand run at right angles to each other; they are of immense length, in consequence of the numerous gardens which intervene between the houses, and have a desolate appearance, few pedestrians being seen, and never more than one or two carriages, drawn by one horse, passing at the same time. In short, I should say this must be a dull town, although the inhabitants have a theatre to enliven them, in which a company of Danish actors were now playing one of our immortal Shakspeare's tragedies, translated into Norse.'—p. 7.

A short excursion was made to Vigeland, a distance of ten English miles, in the hope of finding some sport in fishing, but the weather was unpropitious, and our author's first essay at salmon catching, proved, in consequence,³ unsuccessful. On Friday, the 30th, he sailed for Christiania in the steamer *Constitution*. Everything on board was admirably arranged and beautifully clean; the wines, Sauterne and St. Julien, 2s. 6d. a bottle, were excellent, and the dinner well dressed in the French style. The steamers on this line call at several small places for passengers, and anchor in some snug harbour every night. This gives the traveller an admirable opportunity of acquainting himself with the habits of the people, of which Mr. Milford diligently availed himself. Amongst the characteristics mentioned, is a love of dramatic representations, a theatre appearing 'to be considered as a necessary appendage to most towns.' The inhabitants are represented as a good-looking race, abounding especially in feminine beauty. Only three barons now survive in Norway—the last vestiges of a race once numerous and powerful. This is the result of a law passed in 1814, which annulled the orders of nobility, and abolished the rights of primogeniture. Amongst his fellow voyagers, our author mentions a hawk-catcher, of whom he gives the following account, which will probably surprise some of our uninitiated readers:—

'A man has just entered into conversation with me who has been sent by Prince Alexander, the second son of the King of Holland, the Duke of Leeds, and several other Englishmen fond of hawking, a distance of seven or eight hundred miles, to Jerkin, on the Dovre faill, for the sole purpose of capturing some Norwegian hawks. He told me he should remain at the last-mentioned spot for a month, and expected to catch about half a dozen of these birds. He was taking some live pigeons with him for this purpose, all the way from Amsterdam to the highest mountain pass in Norway. His method is to build a shed in a wild situation, in which he may conceal himself, and then to confine a pigeon to the ground close to an expanded net; the hawk is attracted to the spot, and easily captured. This person had been for twenty years falconer to Lord Bernard, and had lived in Suffolk, but was now employed by a hawking society in Holland. I saw the list of the members. They meet during the months of April, May, June, and part of July of every year. Amongst the names were those of many both of the Dutch and English nobility.'—pp. 24, 25.

Christiania, the most modern of the four capitals of Norway, is represented as 'a fine town, with wide streets and lofty houses, most of them built of stone, and with great regularity. The harbour is excellent, and the trade extensive.' It contains a university with several hundred students, and being the seat of government, has several public buildings on a large scale. 'Its

general appearance, however,' Mr. Milford tells us, 'is gloomy, and I passed through many streets without meeting with any description of vehicle, and scarcely half-a-dozen people. The number of its inhabitants, nevertheless, exceeds 12,000.'

From Christiania our traveller proceeded to Tronjeim, a distance of about three hundred and fifty English miles. His mode of travelling, and the expenses attendant on it, are thus described :—

'We purchased carriages, which, together with the harness, cost 4*l*. each. They are little vehicles with low wheels, very convenient and snug, being just large enough to hold one person, whose feet rest against the cross bar, whilst his legs are protected by a large leathern apron. These light carriages are tolerably easy, for although they have no springs there is much play in the shafts; there is, however, no covering, which is a somewhat awkward circumstance in case of rain, but they are solely intended for summer travelling. The only place for your luggage being upon the board behind, the less you encumber yourself with the better, particularly as upon it the proprietor of the horse occasionally takes his seat, and in more than one instance the contents of my carpet-bag were wofully crushed in consequence.

'We proceeded on our journey, travelling post, the horses being provided by the landed proprietors of the country (*bonder*), at the rate of about a shilling a Norse mile (seven English miles) for each animal, which is about the same expense at which you can travel in England by a public conveyance. Each carriage is drawn by one horse, and you are obliged to send on a forebud, or *avant-courier*, in a cart, ten or twelve hours before you start, to carry your additional luggage, and to have the horses, which are fetched from the plough or from other work, in readiness by the time of your arrival; but you frequently overtake this functionary, in consequence of the temptation which *finkel* offers to him at every post-house; and although a book is kept for the purpose of making known to the proper authorities any complaint either of incivility or delay, the traveller passes on, and seldom avails himself of such an uncertain mode of redress. The duty of the forebud is to leave a printed ticket at each post station, informing the proprietor when you may be expected to arrive, and what number of horses you require. For the trouble of sending to the farmer for these animals, the said proprietor is allowed a fixed charge of four skillings (about twopence), which is called order money, and you have also to pay him a few more skillings for every hour you are after your time.

'The little horses are stiff built, well made, full of spirit, very fast, and sure-footed, and on level ground go at a good rate; the roads, however, although well kept, are generally so hilly that, including stoppages (each change occupies twenty minutes), we never went more than from five to six miles in the hour.'—pp. 30—33.

The post-houses, the only inns along the road, in external appearance and internal accommodation, are about on a par with

the posadas of Spain and Portugal. Our author gives no very tempting account of the accommodation they afford, which we extract, for the information of those of our readers whose love of adventure exceeds their love of ease.

‘ You generally find one large comfortless room, the whole furniture of which consists of a table, a few chairs, and a couple of beds, and in this you both eat and sleep, if not prevented from enjoying ‘tired nature’s calm restorer’ by fleas, musquitoes, bugs, et hoc genus omne of annoyances, with the addition of an infinity of villanous smells, arising from the dirty habits of the people, and but partially counteracted by the strong odour of the tops of the spruce and juniper, which are spread over the floor of every cottage in Norway, for the purpose of keeping it clean.

‘Wo be to the English traveller who does not bring some portable soup and good biscuit with him for this journey, or indeed for any other which he may make in Norway, even from one capital to another. The keen northern air and the hard exercise will sharpen his appetite, but he will find nothing to satisfy it, excepting such unsubstantial food as eggs and coffee. The former you can generally get; the latter always, even in the smallest cottages, but you must wait, although half starving, for a full half hour after your arrival before you can procure even this, for it has first to be roasted, then ground, and afterwards boiled. Now and then we had the additional luxury of bad bacon, for the Norwegian pigs resemble ‘des anatomies vivantes.’—pp. 41, 42.

We pass over the account of the salmon fishing of the Namsen, which Mr. Milford describes as ‘the best salmon river of Europe.’ The disciples of Walton, who want information on this point, may find it in the sixth chapter of our author’s volume. For our own part, we have no taste for such amusements, and therefore pass over the details furnished, for other and more pleasing matter.

Lutheranism is the established religion of Norway, but there is reason to fear that the power of Christianity is exceedingly circumscribed. The people are moral, and the duties of social life are discharged with punctuality, but the higher and spiritual relationships of man receive little attention. The forms of religion are maintained, but the spirit by which they should be animated, and whence they derive all their value, is seldom evidenced. The ordinary effect of a state religion is visible on every hand, and is presented in a form much more favourable than in many other countries; nevertheless, the devout mind will look in vain for those indications of spiritual life which are so prominently exhibited in the word of God. The absence of energy and zeal from the public services of the church is noted by Mr. Milford, though himself apparently but little inclined to require much in this way. It is a wearisome service which the state

stipendiary performs, and its effects are consequently extremely limited.

‘There is a bishop in each of the four provinces of Norway, Tronjeim, Bergen, Aggerhuus (or Christiania), and Christiansand, and their incomes are from 800*l.* to 1000*l.* sterling per annum each, whilst the stipend of the inferior clergy is from 150*l.* to 250*l.* sterling each. No other profession in this country is so well paid. I should say that one of the principal defects of their church establishment is the small number of clergymen. Those whom we met complained to us of the onerous duties they had to fulfil, in consequence of the great distance between the different churches which they serve, and the long and fatiguing journeys they had to make, across the mountains, in all seasons of the year, and in every kind of weather. The result (and it must be most detrimental to the progress of religion) is, that service is only performed occasionally; in some parishes about Ekker once a month, and in others which are more remote only twice a year.’—pp. 224, 225.

The public worship symbolizes with that of Rome. ‘The costume of the priest,’ remarks Mr. Milford, alluding to the service which he attended at Ekker, ‘as well as his occasionally crossing himself, and bowing towards the altar, strongly reminded me of the Roman-catholic worship.’ The same likeness was observable in the recreations indulged in on the Lord’s day, as the following brief extract will show.

‘Sunday is not considered here as with us, a day of rest, nor observed as such for the whole twenty-four hours; the public service of the church being over, the remainder of the day seems to be devoted in Norway, as it is in Roman-catholic countries, to amusement and merry-making. I found after the christening that there was a dance, which lasted till one o’clock the next morning; and had it not been Sunday night I should have made a point of witnessing the scene. Two Englishmen were of the party, and waltzed all night with the Norse belles, who dance remarkably well.

‘I saw many handsome countenances amongst the females; the eyes are their finest feature, but their greatest charms are their extreme modesty and virtue; the conduct of the married as well as of the single women is without reproach. Some of our countrymen who had frequently attended their merry meetings, informed me they had never witnessed an instance of irregularity, nor even the slightest levity of conduct.’—pp. 78, 79.

To the fact alluded to in the latter part of this extract, frequent references are made, which are uniformly honourable to the Norwegian character. ‘Purity of conduct and of morals,’ it is remarked, ‘forms one of the most prominent characteristics of the people of Norway.’ One exception, we are sorry to add, must be made to this favourable description. ‘The vice of drunkenness is the besetting sin of the Norwegians,’ and its

effects, though far less deleterious than in our own country, are of the same order.

On the twenty-third of August, Mr. Milford set off in search of the Lapps, an encampment of whom it was reported was to be found at about seventy miles distance. His guide was a school-master, who, for twenty years, had been in the habit of visiting this simple people every summer, and of residing among them as long as the weather permitted, for the purpose of instructing them in reading and writing. The season was far advanced for such an excursion, and the inconveniences and dangers encountered were by no means inconsiderable. Still our author and his associates persevered, and were amply rewarded, as the following extract will show. The infrequent opportunities we have of introducing our readers to such a scene, must apologize for its length.

‘ Upon our arrival we found the encampment consisted of two circular tents built of poles joined together in the centre, in form of a cone, with cloth stretched over them. The door of the larger one, in which we took up our abode, was so low and small, that we had some difficulty in crawling in. The whole scene was highly picturesque. Each tent was occupied by a Lapp family; every individual gave us a most kind reception, and heartily shaking us by the hand, at once offered us a share of their tent, the only night’s lodging they had to give. We thankfully accepted their hospitality, and soon found ourselves laying on skins before a large and cheerful fire. The inhabitants of the hut comprised three generations of Lapps,—namely, a middle-aged man and his wife, with four children and an old grandmother; to these were now added our party, consisting of four Englishmen, their two interpreters, and two other attendants. The tent was made of coarse dark cloth, and the outside of it was covered with turf; around the inside were hung cheeses, bladders, dried gut of reindeer, guns, and various other useful articles. The chief part of the smoke escaped through a large opening at the top, but enough remained painfully to affect our eyes, and to give the copper countenances of the Lapps a shade as dark as those of Indians. The second family, who occupied the smaller tent,—namely, our late Lapp guide, Peter Johansen, his wife and two children, soon came to pay us a visit. I have already described his person. His wife and daughter had light hair and fair complexions, and were pleasing in their appearance, and his little boy was an intelligent and interesting child, and although under ten years of age, took his turn with the men in watching the reindeer during the night. He was dressed in his best clothes, entirely made of skins, with a girdle round his waist, and such a protuberance in front as to give him the appearance of being stuffed, and greatly to excite our laughter. He wore his knife in its case behind, and several small ornaments by his side, thus forming a complete Lilliputian Lapp in full costume.

‘ We were soon presented with a large bowl of reindeer milk, which is much richer than that of the cow, and has a delicate and aromatic flavour, with a pleasant taste, resembling the milk of the cocoa-nut; but I found I could not take much of it with impunity, as it was more like drinking cream than milk. They also boiled for us a reindeer ham, which had only been salted two days before. We found it so good, that upon taking our departure next morning, we were glad to add it to our scanty store of provisions. It has a wild flavour, and is quite equal to our park venison.

‘ The old grandmother was as shrivelled as a mummy, but the other two women were by no means ill looking. Their dress was of dark woollen cloth, with silver ornaments in front, as well as in the girdle round the waist, to which sewing implements were suspended. These ornaments were in good taste, and well finished; and the buttons were similar to those used by the peasantry in Spain. I have no doubt this smart costume was put on in compliment to us. The dress of the men consisted of leather coats, and tight trousers of the same material, with reindeer-skin boots. All the females smoked, and the old woman seemed more pleased with having her pipe filled with tobacco brought from England, than with anything else that we gave her. Some boxes of Lucifer matches which we presented to them were also highly prized; they had evidently never seen them before, and expressed no small astonishment at the manner in which ignition is effected. We regretted we had no fish-hooks, which they inquired for; but we gave them a glass of finkel each, which the octogenarian appeared to relish more than any of her descendants. The head of the family (Johan Nielson) was a grave, sedate-looking man; decision of character and intelligence were marked on his fine countenance. In reply to the questions I put to him through my interpreter, he said they were happy in the enjoyment of their wandering pastoral life; that they confined themselves to the mountainous ridge which separates Norway from Sweden, the boundary line between these countries being only two English miles from the spot where they were then encamped; that they had been there about eight days, intended to remain a fortnight longer, and should then move onwards for a change of pasture for their reindeer. He told me that in summer they conduct these animals, which constitute their wealth, to the elevated parts of the mountains, and in the winter they descend to the level country. His herd consisted of about three hundred, and it appears that a family requires nearly that number for its support. The great proportion of them were his own property, but some belonged to Peter Johansen, and ten to a middle-aged single woman who lodged with them. These Lapps, although ‘ dwellers in tents’ all the year round, are in many respects far from being uncivilized. They strictly observe the sabbath, the best reader of the family officiating as priest, and going regularly through the Lutheran service. Occasionally they attend the church of the nearest village on the frontier of Sweden.

‘ Our guide, the schoolmaster, is employed by the missionary society, and twice in the course of every summer attends the Lapps, for the

purpose of instructing them. He stays for three weeks on each occasion, and divides his time between the different families who are encamped many miles apart. This man told me that all the children could read, write, and say their prayers. The Lapps have but few wants, and appear perfectly satisfied; having no bread, they subsist almost entirely on the produce of their herds, with the occasional assistance of fish and game. We saw no other description of food whatever, neither have they any candles; and when we required additional light, one of the women took a firebrand in her hand and held it up for us. On one occasion we wanted to pour some of their delicious milk into our small keg of finkel; in an instant they very ingeniously made a funnel of some of the birch bark which hung round the tent. The sun and stars are their only clock. They had no spirituous liquors, but it is well known that they are generally addicted to inebriety; and doubtless, when the opportunity occurs of going down into the valleys, either of Sweden or of Norway, they indulge in this, their one besetting sin.

‘Both Nielson and Johansen are great hunters, and occasionally are absent from the encampment for many weeks together, in search of bears, seals, and game. It was nearly midnight before our interesting conference with Johan Nielson was brought to a close. He at length asked us in a civil, I might almost say in a polite manner, whether we felt disposed to sleep. To this we assented; and when all was quiet, and most eyes were closed, I surveyed with no little interest the singular scene around me. Our host lit his pipe, by way of a soporific, laid down his head on his hard pillow, and comfortably puffed himself to sleep. One of the children coming in late, the old grandmother lifted up her large reindeer covering, and inclosed the young herdsman within its ample folds. It was a fine night, and we felt no inconvenience either from heat or cold. We were, however, as closely packed all round the tent as negroes in a slave ship, and it would have been difficult for a single additional person to have found a berth. I slept soundly notwithstanding. We were so near the fire, that my foot would have been burnt had not one of my companions awakened me, and pointed out the danger. It will be long before the details of this night will be forgotten by any of us; and we all regretted that there was no artist amongst us to have sketched some of the more characteristic features of the scene.’—pp. 159—167.

The government of Norway is a limited monarchy, hereditary in the male line of the royal family of Sweden. The king is required to profess the Lutheran religion, and wields exclusively the executive power, the legislative being shared with the *Storthing*, or national assembly. The construction of this body is popular, and, in Mr. Milford’s judgment, little adapted to meet the varying necessities of the case. The Norwegians, however, are jealous of the Swedes, to whose crown they were forcibly united in 1814, and are not, therefore, inclined to any alteration which would increase the influence, or render more fixed, the

power of that court. Our author's account of the Storting is as follows, in which his political predilections are sufficiently apparent.

‘ Many of the most judicious of the Norwegians are convinced that this storting is too democratic in its construction, and that the machine, however well it may work in quiet times, will prove insufficient in the hour of need. The session of the storting does not exceed three months, and as it takes place only once in every three years, very injurious delays frequently occur, in enactments ultimately connected with the public good. The legislature has jealously excluded all the best and most intelligent persons from its halls, by disqualifying every one who is connected with the court or the government, or who is in the receipt of any income derived from the national purse, whether in the shape of salary or pension, and thus those individuals who, from their position, must naturally be the most conversant with public affairs, are interdicted from all legislative power. Although some individuals connected with the church and the law are elected, the deputies principally consist of yeomen, whose views, as is common with tillers of the soil, are somewhat too practical,—somewhat too economical; their niggardly votes of supplies hamper all local and general improvements; and they have carried measures, such as the abolition of hereditary distinctions, the equal division of property among children, &c., which, according to our notions, must sap the very foundations of a limited monarchy. Of this the Norwegians themselves are perfectly aware; but they contend that the government of Norway is a pure democracy, and that as their country has been appended to Sweden, without their consent having been sought or obtained, the present system of legislature is the only one which gives them any chance of maintaining their national independence. As there is no intermediate house between themselves and the crown, and as a bill which has passed a third storting becomes a law, without the king's signature, the crown only possesses a veto, which, when twice exercised, ceases; and there is, in fact, no barrier whatever, no protection for the upper classes, or for the supreme chief. Hitherto, as they have had peace at home, and no foreign war, things have gone on smoothly, and the ill-constructed machine has kept together; but should invasion, rebellion, or any powerfully disturbing element arise, to shake the fabric of society, their system of representation would be exposed to a trial which it is little fitted to sustain; in short, the duration of this ill-devised government seems very problematical.’—pp. 208—210.

Mr. Milford's volume is written in a simple and unassuming style. It wears a truthful aspect, and bespeaks good sense and a cultivated mind.

- Art. VIII. 1. *Notes of a Tour in the Manufacturing Districts of Lancashire.* By W. Cooke Taylor, LL.D., &c. London: Duncan and Malcolm. 1842. pp. 299.
2. *The Disturbances in the Manufacturing Districts.* *Morning Chronicle*, August, 1842.
3. *Speech of Richard Cobden, Esq., M.P., to the Anti-Corn-Law League, in reference to the disturbances in the Manufacturing Districts.* Manchester: Prentice and Co.

PROVIDENCE has wisely ordered that no portion of the human family should be entirely independent of all others. Each district of the globe has been endowed with peculiar advantages. The tea-plant of China, the cotton and corn of America, the coffee and sugar of Brazil and the West Indies, the timber of the Baltic, and the minerals of our own country, are all so many instances of the benevolence and wisdom of the great Giver of all good. We think that the evident design of the Creator in this arrangement is, by rendering the products of each country necessary and subservient to the comforts of the rest of the world, to promote a universal feeling of peace and good will. That so glorious a design should be frustrated by human laws is a sad proof of our depravity, and is necessarily the cause of much suffering. Commerce, or in other words, the exchange of the products of one people for those of another, is the golden cord which binds together the most distant nations, and whenever that cord is broken, jealousy, bitterness, and strife, are the almost inevitable results. Some trifling occurrence, magnified by ill feeling on both sides, is followed by war with its attendant calamities, its awful sacrifice of life, and its useless expenditure of wealth. But these are not the only evil results of the breach of this great natural law of mutual dependence. A nation which should attempt, with purblind selfishness, to render itself independent of all others, would necessarily fall into a state of barbarism and decay. But an *entire* independence, perhaps, no party advocates; the most bigoted monopolist can see at once the absurdity of building mills upon the sugar plantations of Cuba, or of erecting hot-houses for cotton in England, and yet it would be equally as wise to do so as it is to attempt to make this nation independent of foreign supplies of food; the attempt *must* fail, and its only effects can be disaster and ruin. The fact is, for many years we have been dependent upon other countries for supplies of grain, and the operation of the Corn Laws has been to make that supply precarious, and, by limiting its amount, to enhance artificially the price of the home produce, to derange commercial transactions, and to deprive thousands of employment.

Time after time have we directed the attention of our readers to the fearful state of privation under which great masses of our countrymen are suffering. Had this misery been the natural result of certain causes over which we had no control,—had God, for some wise end, laid his hand heavy upon the people, we might have mourned over the distress, but should scarcely have thought it necessary to fill our pages with its harrowing details. We have however done so, because we believe that this famine is created by man's laws. Our hard-handed artisans *could* buy corn with the earnings of their toil, and God *has* provided for them the food necessary for their subsistence, but His bounties are interrupted, and groaning multitudes starve, that the selfishness of a few may be gratified. The North Western States of America overflow with abundant harvests. Waving fields of corn spread over a vast extent of territory, and the produce is far greater than our transatlantic brethren require for their own wants. Why then do the operatives of Britain cry aloud for food in vain? Their ingenuity and industry enable them to offer, in exchange for wheat, manufactured goods, which the Americans are anxious to obtain, but an Act of Parliament steps in and prohibits the barter, and the beneficent arrangements of providence are rendered of none effect! Every cry, then, from our suffering countrymen rises to heaven in testimony against our heartless aristocracy, and every record of starvation and distress should stimulate the Christian and the patriot to make still further efforts for the total overthrow of monopoly.

The work which we have placed at the head of this article could not have appeared more seasonably. Its author took the opportunity, afforded by a visit to Lancashire in June last, of examining into the condition of the manufacturing population, and he has given us the results of his observation in the form of a series of letters to the Archbishop of Dublin. Dr. Taylor is, in every respect, well calculated for the task which he has undertaken. Unconnected with the manufacturing interest, and in a great measure free from the trammels of party feeling, he is in a position to judge impartially of the facts which came beneath his notice. He states in his preface that his 'sole anxiety was to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth,' and our own knowledge enables us to attest fully the correctness of many of his statements. Dr. Taylor has written under the influence of immediate impressions, he 'jotted down' things just as they occurred, and there is consequently a vividness and graphic power in his descriptions which add much to the interest and value of the work. We are convinced that the 'tour' will add largely to the reputation which its benevolent author had

previously acquired, and we have pleasure in strongly recommending it to the early attention of our readers.

It has been the fashion with many persons to express a vast deal of sympathy with the factory operatives, and we have heard much of the degradation to which this class are exposed, of the cruelty of 'tyrannous cotton lords,' and of the superior condition of the agricultural population. The ferocious tirades of Mr. Ferrand made the treasury benches echo with applause, and the reiterated calumnies of the *Times* and the *Standard* have, we doubt not, made their readers believe that the poor cotton spinners and weavers are more cruelly treated than were the slaves in the West Indies. Dr. Taylor's work shows the utter absurdity and falsehood of these statements, which are too often made with a view of diverting attention from the real causes of the distress. At Turton and Egerton, where the mills of Messrs. Ashworth are situated, Dr. Taylor had the opportunity of observing the state of the workpeople when in full employment. He remarks, that 'the conditions of health in the mills of Turton and Egerton, and I may add generally in all that I have examined, are exceedingly favourable. The working rooms are lofty, spacious, and well ventilated, kept at an equable temperature, and scrupulously clean. There is nothing in sight, sound, or smell, to offend the most fastidious sense.' 'With respect to the length of time during which the work is continued, I must remark that the toil is not very great, nor is it incessant.' A short time previously to Dr. Taylor's visit, Messrs. Ashworth had found it necessary to reduce the wages of their men, and he states that the operatives were satisfied that their employers had been reluctantly compelled to do so in consequence of the decay of trade, which 'they universally attributed to the refusal of our government to admit the materials of payment proffered by those who were anxious to become our customers.' And then, as to the domestic comforts of the operatives:—

'I visited the interior of nearly every cottage; I found all well, and very many respectably furnished: there were generally a mahogany table and chest of drawers. Daughters from most of the houses, but *wives*, as far as I could learn, *from none*, worked in the factory. Many of the women were not a little proud of their housewifery, and exhibited the Sunday wardrobes of their husbands, the stock of neatly folded shirts, &c., and one of them gave me a very eloquent lecture on the mysteries of needle work, of which I did not comprehend a syllable; but I could very well appreciate the results in the neatness and comfort around me.'—pp. 28, 29.

In connexion with the mills, schools have been established, and Dr. Taylor describes his visit to them as being peculiarly inter-

esting. The children, on examination, were found to possess information on mental arithmetic, geography, scripture history, &c., above the average of any school which the Doctor had ever visited. The boys and girls employed in the mills were as 'merry as crickets,' and all the workpeople appeared contented and happy. A similar scene—alas! that there should be so few now in Lancashire,—was witnessed at Hollymount, where the mills of Messrs. Whitehead are situated.

'The residences of the operatives are not so much cottages as handsome houses, consisting of from four to six rooms, provided with every convenience necessary for comfort and cleanliness. They are all well furnished, in many cases with mahogany: I saw none destitute of a clock and a small collection of books, generally on religious subjects. The children in the village were remarkably healthy, neat, and intelligent. They answered the few casual questions addressed to them with a politeness of demeanour, and propriety of expression, which could not be surpassed in much higher ranks of life. I was informed that most of the men were teetotallers, and that they had invested considerable sums in the savings' bank. If the entire forest had been similar to Hollymount, it would have been an earthly paradise.'—pp. 58, 59.

The school attached to the factory is described as a very elegant and convenient building. The children subscribe twopence a week for their education, which is allowed to accumulate as a reserve fund, to be paid back to each pupil at twenty-one years of age. The benevolent proprietors have also erected a place of worship, at which they and their workpeople attend. Need we wonder, that with such advantages the villagers of Hollymount are 'healthy, happy, and contented?' Where, amidst the agricultural districts of England, could a similar congregation of happy labourers be found?

Dr. Taylor bears a willing testimony to the virtues of both the employers and the employed. So far from the 'cotton lords' being ashamed of their proceedings, they received a stranger, whose object was to inquire into their conduct, with the greatest cordiality. 'I am bound in gratitude to add,' says Dr. Taylor, 'that when my anxiety to obtain information on the subject became known, every possible facility was offered and afforded by the manufacturers and millowners. *All we wish is to be known; there is nothing in our entire system which we desire to be concealed,*' was the universal cry, and of the sincerity with which it was uttered, I have received the most striking and convincing demonstrations.' Messrs. Ashworth's and Whitehead's are fine samples of their 'order,' but there are many, very many others, with as kind a disposition towards their workpeople, although they may not have equal means of carrying their benevolence

into effect. 'A healthy spirit of emulation has long existed among the proprietors of rural mills and print works; they were not less proud of the comforts and respectable appearance of their operatives, than a nobleman is of his palace or demesne.' The working men, too, have secured the warmest expressions of admiration from Dr. Taylor. For years have they borne up with fortitude and with heroism against the flood of suffering which has overwhelmed them. And in the midst of it all, they have displayed, not only vast powers of endurance, but a nobleness of mind which impresses us with the highest feelings of respect. Every expedient is resorted to before they will offend their sense of manly independence by soliciting aid from the Poor Law Guardians. Listen to the testimony of the commissioners appointed by government to inquire into the state of Stockport. They found many 'enduring distress with patience, and *abstaining, sometimes to the injury of health, from making any application for relief*; while others who *have been driven reluctantly to that extremity*, we have seen receiving a degree of relief, sufficient only to support life, often with thankfulness and gratitude, and generally without murmur or complaint.' But this is not all. There is reason to believe that some have *died* in consequence of their unwillingness to apply for parochial relief. A case of this nature is recorded in the report of the commissioners. Mr. Blackshaw, a respectable surgeon, resident in Stockport, stated, in evidence, that a man of the name of Frost had died in consequence of the privations which he had endured previously to receiving relief from the Union. The surgeon, on visiting him, asked him why he had not made earlier application for relief, and the reply was, that '*he wished to go on as long as he could.*' Mr. Blackshaw ascribed this to a 'spirit of independence,' and he stated that 'many would rather sacrifice all their furniture than apply to the parish.' Of course this character is not universal, but still it is sufficiently common to be regarded as a general attribute of the people. The commissioners further report that, 'in some instances, the weekly allowance had been voluntarily resigned immediately on their having obtained some other means of support.'

Dr. Taylor mentions that an operative, 'a living skeleton of a giant,' who was almost borne down with suffering, told him that 'he had been for seventeen weeks without work of any kind, and had been principally supported by the charity of neighbours little better off than himself. *When I offered him a shilling he refused to receive it until I had given my name and address, in order that he might repay it if ever an opportunity offered.*' This was noble; but there is still a finer instance of the unobtrusive virtues of the poor.

‘ I went into the house of a widow who had three children. She was one of the most intelligent, naturally polite persons I ever saw. She told me that the earnings of herself and two of her children amounted together to about eleven shillings per week; and that though they had once been better off, they felt themselves comparatively happy when they contrasted their condition with that of their neighbours. I remained some time, and on parting, offered her a shilling for the trouble I had given. ‘ No, sir,’ she replied, ‘ *I cannot take your money while there are many so much worse around me: allow me to send it to a family suffering from sickness as well as want;*’ and forthwith she sent her daughter with the shilling to the house whose misery she had been describing.’—pp. 81, 82.

There is something exceedingly touching in the pure benevolence of this poor widow. How would her conduct put to the blush the occupants of many a lordly hall or gilded palace! And yet such charity, elevated though it be, is found in many of the poorest cottages of Lancashire.

‘ Throughout the entire of the district I found the most distressed dwell invariably on the assistance which they received from their neighbours. ‘ We must have perished but for the charity of our neighbours,’ was a phrase which met me everywhere; and invariably I found, upon inquiry, that their neighbours were very little better off than themselves.’—p. 82.

Although there is still much work for the schoolmaster in Lancashire, yet it must not be supposed that the people are in a state of besotted ignorance. Vast numbers are highly intelligent, and display a considerable amount of information. Dr. Taylor states, that during his tour, he ‘ heard the most important lessons in moral science and political economy from the lips of persons who have never been inside the doors of what may be called a study.’ He took notes of conversations which he had with the operatives, and they abundantly prove that these men see through the fallacies which the bread-taxers attempt to blind them with. Take, for instance, the senseless cry of ‘ don’t be dependent upon foreigners for your supplies.’ Dr. Taylor asked a ‘ fustian jacket’ if he had no fear, that were the Corn Laws repealed, ‘ foreign nations would refuse to supply us with corn: might they not enter into a conspiracy to starve us?’ *He laughed in my face,* and said, ‘ I have no fear of getting bread so long as I have the means of paying for it. The baker over the way hates me as he hates the —, on account of a rough and tumble [boxing and wrestling] which we had at the election, but I assure you he would not be such a fool as to refuse my custom for a loaf.’ Dr. Taylor had been talking with another operative, and could not avoid expressing surprise at the amount of information on political economy which he possessed. He coolly replied, ‘ I hope

you will never have such a teacher as I have had, *it has been starved into me!*

As might be anticipated, Dr. Taylor's *Tour* is full of the melancholy details of the sufferings of the operatives, but our space will only allow us to quote a few instances. Of Bolton, he remarks, 'that the mass of the population is on the very brink of sheer destitution, and that thousands are absolutely starving.' It has been calculated that the diminution of wages in this ill-fated town amounts to 200,000*l.* annually, which, added to the increased expenditure produced by the increased price of food, amounting, it is believed, to 118,000*l.* per annum, shows that the injury done to the working population by the corn and provision laws must be estimated at '320,000*l.* annually, or about 1000*l.* for every working day!' A government commissioner has, it seems, been sent down to relieve the distress of Bolton by the distribution of 500*l.*, or 'just one half of the sum fiscally subtracted' from the wages of the operatives every working day! Dr. Taylor may well ask, 'Is this mockery, or is it reality?' S. Forster, Esq., the Chairman of the Board of Guardians of Stockport, gives the following account of the state of the starving operatives in that town:—

'The clothing of the women is very wretched, and by no means adequate to protect the body from disease. This we are frequently reminded of from some of our medical officers, who have informed us that medicine would be unavailing without an increase of apparel. . . . But perhaps nothing can so forcibly portray the depth of the present misery as the great want of beds and bedding. This destitution is abundantly confirmed both by medical and relieving officers—by the testimony of such as have visited the dwellings of the poor who have applied to our board for bedding, many of whom, we understand, have no bed; some a few flocks, or a little straw, spread in the corner of their room or cellar; no covering but a single sheet or rug. Many have to lie together to the number of six, seven, eight, and more, of both sexes, indiscriminately huddled together in their clothes, covered by an old sack or rug; no sheets, blankets, or coverlids. In these cases we have a wretchedness that cannot have entered into the contemplation of most people—a degradation which cannot be thought seriously of, both as to its moral and physical effects, without apprehension as to the consequences; and though it may be doubted by those who do not wish to believe such distress exists, it is nevertheless true; yea, and greater than this is also true; for we know that the infant has been brought into the world on the floor of one of these abodes of wretchedness, because there was not either bed, sheet, blanket, or bed-cover, and no provision had been made for the infant. . . . We have also reason to believe some have died of starvation. *Cases of this kind are kept as much as possible from the public view.* Some have been mentioned which have attracted the notice of those con-

nected with government, at least, the Poor Law Commissioners; but we believe more have taken place.'—pp. 211—213.

After reading such statements as these, who can be surprised at the occurrence of scenes like the following? In Burnley, the streets were filled with groups of idlers, 'their faces haggard with famine, and their eyes rolling with that fierce and uneasy expression which I have often noticed in maniacs.' These people were discussing the best means of obtaining the redress of their grievances,—they were all Chartists, and the block-printers and hand-loom weavers were heard by Dr. Taylor *openly* advocating 'the expediency of burning down the mills, in order to compel the factory hands to join in an insurrectionary movement.' In Padiham, a still greater degree of violence was manifested, 'teeth were set, hands were clenched, and curses of fearful bitterness pronounced with harrowing energy.' 'There was a reckless desperation,' says Dr. Taylor, 'about the aspect of misery in Padiham, which was unlike anything I ever saw in Lancashire, but I doubt if it be more dangerous than the steady and fixed resolution to obtain a redress of real or imaginary grievances which I found among the people in Colne and Marsden.' After the scenes which our author had witnessed, we do not wonder at his giving expression to the following opinions:—

'There is yet time to avert the calamities which the state of things before me is calculated to produce. But if the remedial measures be too long delayed,—if the opportunity—the golden opportunity—offered by the rejection of the American tariff be neglected, the war between the 'have-nots' and the 'haves' must inevitably break out, and Coleridge's fearful eclogue of 'fire, famine, and slaughter,' will become applicable to districts far more important and extensive than La Vendée. This alarm is suggested by no loud threat or angry declaration; I have heard little of such vapouring in Lancashire; *it arises from hearing stern declamations made with a concentrated energy and bitter resoluteness which found vent in few and brief sentences*: these were pregnant with meaning, and meant far more than they said. I endeavoured to remonstrate with one of these men, and to show him the perils of the course which he wished to see adopted: he cut me very short, and coolly informed me that 'the time for argument was gone past.'—pp. 152, 153.

The remedial measures are still delayed; and since Dr. Taylor wrote the above passage, the war between the 'have-nots' and the 'haves' has, we fear, commenced. The recent disturbances, as our readers are probably aware, began with the workpeople of Mr. Sparrow, an iron-master in Staffordshire, and arose out of a dispute about wages, which afterwards extended through the mining districts. In Lancashire, the turn-out commenced at Staleybridge. The manufacturers of that town, having disco-

vered that they were paying higher wages than were given in other places, announced to the workpeople their intention of making a reduction. To this proposal the weavers refused to submit, and in consequence left their employment. This was followed by various meetings; and on Sunday the 7th of August, eight or ten thousand people assembled on Mottram Moor, and it is understood that the operations for the ensuing week were then determined upon. On the following day the turnouts visited the various mills in Staleybridge, and having induced the workmen to join them, proceeded to Ashton, Dukinfield, &c., and stopped the whole of the factories. Strange to say, during all this time the Manchester authorities were not apprised of the disturbances in the surrounding districts, and on Tuesday morning, August ninth, were astonished by the sudden announcement that a mob, consisting of several thousands, was entering the town. A troop of cavalry, headed by the stipendiary magistrate and other gentlemen, immediately proceeded to stop the progress of the rioters, but on receiving a pledge from the leaders that the procession should move orderly through the streets, and that no destruction of property was contemplated, the authorities thought it right to allow the people to proceed. Detachments of the mob were speedily sent to the various mills and workshops to summon the workpeople to join the turnouts, and, in most cases, found a ready acquiescence in their wishes. When any refusal was given, the rioters, by throwing stones at the windows of the factory, speedily convinced the managers of the propriety of yielding to their demands, and the men were turned out amidst the cheering of the tumultuous assemblage. So rapid were these movements, that the military and police were unable to prevent them, and, in a few hours, the immense productive power of the commercial metropolis was standing utterly idle. The streets were filled with the turnouts, many of the shops were closed, and the scene was one of confusion and dismay. Various bodies of men were, during this time, perambulating the town, begging, or rather demanding bread from the bakers, who, of course, were not in a position to refuse their requests. The magistrates adopted every means in their power to protect property and prevent the further disturbance of the town. The riot act was read, troops were sent down from London, and thousands of special constables sworn in. In the meanwhile the spirit of insubordination spread through other parts of the country. At Preston a serious conflict between the rioters and military ended fatally, several of the turnouts being mortally wounded. Rochdale, Todmorden, and from thence, Yorkshire, became a scene of confusion. At Elland, near Halifax, the rioters surrounded a small party of soldiers, two of whom they

severely wounded, and broke the sword of the officer. In Scotland, matters assumed an alarming appearance, and the strike extended throughout the mining districts. Potato fields were plundered in many places, and other acts of violence committed. In Staffordshire, where the strike commenced, and where the population is far inferior, both morally and intellectually, to the factory operatives, the most serious destruction of property has taken place. On Monday, the sixteenth of August, a meeting of colliers was held at Shelton, which was addressed by several Chartist leaders, in violent speeches, and immediately after the work of destruction commenced. The seats of several gentlemen were burned to the ground, or completely emptied of the furniture. The police office at Hanley was forcibly entered into, and the public books, papers, &c., were destroyed. Several lock-ups were opened, and the prisoners set at liberty. At Burslem many of the rioters were killed or wounded by the military. The colliers in Leicestershire subsequently joined the strike, and the whole of the Midland counties were in a state of the greatest excitement.

In Manchester a 'Great Delegate Conference' was summoned on Monday, the sixteenth of August, when eighty-five trades and public bodies sent deputies. This conference, which was of a decidedly Chartist complexion, lost the confidence of many of the workpeople, and soon dwindled into insignificance. On Sunday, August twenty-second, there were only twelve left out of the one hundred and forty-four delegates, and these poor men, on learning that their chairman had been arrested, immediately adjourned *sine die*. The resumption of work gradually followed, and although large numbers of weavers, at the time we write, are still 'out,' yet all apprehensions are quelled for the present.

Much has been said and written about the cause of this alarming outbreak. Sir R. Peel, in the closing speech of the session, attempted to cast the blame upon the Anti-Corn-Law League, and his suggestion has been echoed by the Tory press throughout the kingdom. It was a gloomy time for parliament to be prorogued. The right honourable Baronet knew that the 'faithful commons' were about to be congratulated by her Majesty on having passed measures 'calculated to promote the general and permanent welfare of all classes of her subjects,' and that her Majesty was about to assure the assembled legislators of her confidence in the 'indications of gradual recovery from that depression which has affected many branches of manufacturing industry, and exposed large classes of her people to privations and sufferings which have caused her the deepest concern;' we say, Sir Robert Peel was well aware of the confident words which

he was about to put in her Majesty's mouth, and yet at that moment London was ringing with the most alarming accounts from all parts of the country, orders for troops were being dispatched, and there was every prospect that, before her Majesty again met parliament, violence and bloodshed would have cast a gloom over every class of the community! Such were the 'indications of gradual recovery!' Mr. Mark Philips 'implored the government to give to the evils prevailing in the manufacturing districts their most earnest and solemn consideration. *They were evils that threatened to disorganize society, and to spread themselves wider and wider, until they involved the whole country in one common ruin, and one common downfall.*' After this, the assurance of the Queen that there were 'indications of gradual recovery,' must have sounded very like mockery. The wily leader no doubt felt the discrepancy, he knew that passing events were rapidly fulfilling the solemn warnings of the League, and being unable to overthrow their principles, he seized the moment, when no reply could be offered, to malign their characters. 'He must say that during a period of severe distress, and when the people manifested a degree of patience and fortitude which reflected the highest credit upon them, *attempts were made, and studiously made, to inflame their passions, and exasperate them into violence.* Yes,' continued the right honourable Baronet, 'the people, to their credit be it spoken, were disposed to be quiet. I have admired their fortitude under their privations. They are not to be blamed, but *those who have used expressions calculated to incite the people, are to be blamed*; and it is questionable whether some who have used such language may not repent the course they have taken.' Of course the monopolists loudly cheered this attack, but, to say the least of it, it was ungenerous in Sir Robert to take such an opportunity of calumniating the League, when he knew that a summons from the Usher of the Black Rod would prevent the possibility of a reply; but the premier seldom allows considerations of principle or of honesty to interfere with his seizing a momentary advantage. The League, however, stand in no danger from the charge. The calumny is utterly groundless. So far from the League being the authors of the riots, it may safely be asserted that they have done more than any other party to preserve the peace of the country. Their efforts to promote the best interests of the nation have been unwearied. Conference after conference have assembled, and have laid before government, and brought under the notice of the legislature, statements of the highest importance, and have demonstrated, by irrefutable proofs, that the Corn Laws are the main causes of the distress which, for so long a period, has covered our land. Repeated and solemn have been the warnings given by these

patriotic men, that the necessary effect of the Corn Laws, by producing starvation and misery, must be riot and violence. Publicly and privately have they prayed the ministers to save the country from destruction, by granting the repeal of all commercial restrictions. In the hall of legislation, the most eminent member of the League told the monopolists that the 'country *was drifting to confusion without rudder or compass.*' And is it not preposterous that after all these exertions, and after all these warnings, the Anti-Corn-Law League should be accused as the authors of the evils which they predicted as the necessary and inevitable consequences of monopoly? We shall not offend our readers by the further consideration of an accusation which is so obviously false.

The other party accused of being the authors of these riots, are the Chartists. The *Manchester Guardian*, a Whig paper of considerable influence, regards the turnout as the 'carrying out of that fiendish scheme developed by Mr. Feargus O'Connor and other agitators, so long ago as October, 1838, under the name of the 'sacred week,' and 'the national holiday;' which was twice or thrice announced in the early part of 1839, and which was finally attempted to be carried into execution on the twelfth of August in that year, a day which is significantly near the date of the present outbreak.' Now we think it can be proved that Chartism did not originate the late movement. In Lancashire as well as in Staffordshire it commenced with a dispute about wages. At Ashton, the turnouts published an address to the manufacturers, in which they say that '*such are our sufferings, in consequence of low wages, and numerous other things, that we can no longer tamely submit to it.*' We therefore wish you to give us the same prices that we received in the year 1840.' The address proceeds to notice the great reduction of wages for weaving, &c., but does not contain any allusion to the Charter. At the first meeting in Manchester the speakers carefully explained that they were connected with no political party, and that their only object was to obtain 'a fair day's wages for a fair day's work.' The chairman stated that 'he had known several instances in which persons had dropped down dead from actual starvation. It was to remedy this state of things that they had turned out, and *not for the advancement of any political object.*' Another of the speakers asserted that they had not met 'for the destruction of property or machinery, but to obtain the co-operation of the people of Manchester, in seeking a fair day's wages for a fair day's labour.' Several others spoke to the same effect, and from the report it appears that none connected the movement with the Charter. The following morning a second meeting was held in Granby-row-fields, and again the subject of higher wages was

the prominent topic upon which the declamation of the speakers was expended. When the strike had emptied all the mills and workshops in Manchester, and when the people were in a state of the greatest excitement, then, and not till then, certain Chartist leaders seized the opportunity of promoting their sentiments, and attempted to convert what was originally a mere turn out for wages, into a national movement in favour of the 'People's Charter.' It cannot be wondered at that numbers of the distressed operatives eagerly followed the Chartist leaders, although there is abundant evidence to prove that many of the turnouts refused to swerve from their original intentions. At the meeting of the delegates on the sixteenth of August, one of the speakers stated that 'the body he represented were willing to cease from labour until wages were advanced; but *if the agitation were employed for political objects they were determined to return to their work.*' Another delegate 'denounced as foolish and insane the recommendation to the working classes not to return to their labour until they obtained the Charter.' Several other delegates expressed similar opinions. We admit that the majority of the deputies were Chartists, but we have already stated that the conference lost the confidence of many of the operatives, and after its dissolution, the strike resumed its original character, and the workpeople who remained out of employment did so on the *sole grounds* that they required an advance of wages.

After a calm review, therefore, of the whole proceedings, we cannot avoid forming the conclusion that the strike resulted entirely from the reduction of wages. The real cause was *distress*, and the authors of the distress are clearly the authors of the riots. We indulge in no exaggeration when we assert that government, and government alone, are responsible for the disturbances which have taken place. The inevitable effect of the depression of trade is the reduction of wages. Like everything else, the price of labour depends upon the supply, and if the market is glutted, its value must fall. It is quite absurd to suppose that the manufacturers have the power of reducing wages. Had Sir Robert Peel, during the last session, repealed the Corn Laws, every mill in the kingdom would have been called into activity, the demand for labour would have rapidly increased, the unemployed thousands would have found scope for their industry, wages would have advanced, the price of food would have fallen, and we should have heard nothing of the disturbances in the manufacturing districts. No inflammatory speeches can excite a happy people into rebellion, and a government which rules for the good of the many, need not fear any 'attempts to exasperate them into violence.'

It is true that these disturbances are at an end for the present,

but who can guarantee the continued peace of the manufacturing districts for a single hour? The influence of the military and the police have produced the appearance of tranquillity, but the embers of revolution are smouldering beneath the surface of society. Sir R. Peel praises the 'patience and fortitude of the people,' and says 'they are not to be blamed,' which is very true; but when they find that hollow words are all the evidences of sympathy which their sufferings obtain, is it surprising that they lose all confidence in the government, and attempt to redress their grievances by their own strength? Their 'patience and fortitude' have been sufficiently tried, the interests of the nation have been sufficiently trifled with, and yet honourable gentlemen and noble lords spend their time on the moors, apparently utterly careless of everything that does not interfere with their luxurious enjoyments. Surely, surely, the people deserve better treatment at the hands of their legislators; even in the late riots their general forbearance was as remarkable as it was pleasing. We were in Manchester during the turnout, and although the town was completely at the mercy of the 'mob,' although starvation must have almost driven many of the rioters to desperation, yet we witnessed no violence, and thousands were perambulating the streets without committing the slightest injury to property. They were a sad spectacle,—the victims of a vicious legislation. But this cannot go on long. These disturbances are but 'the beginning of the end.' Mr. Cobden, in his powerful speech to the League, justly remarked that—

'It is not enough for government to say that they have put down the people here by the military; it is not enough for them to say that they have got thousands of poor wretches in prison,—a larger number, I believe, than was ever known to be in the prisons of this country for any public delinquency since the days of Henry the Eighth,—I say it is not enough for them to say that they have quelled the disturbances by imprisoning or shooting the people; the duty lies with government still—and we must urge it upon them—to *find employment and subsistence for the people*. The manufacturers and tradesmen of this part of the country have told the government and the aristocracy,—'If you will allow us, we will find employment and subsistence for the people.' And what has been the answer? 'You have incited them to insurrection!' 'Very well, then,' we say; 'having put it down in your own way, tell us how you are to find them employment; and you shall never have peace or rest from us until you find employment, and give content to the people of this country.'—*Speech*, pp. 7, 8.

Mr. Cobden asks, 'what was it which swelled the numbers of the turnouts,—what caused these multitudes to roam over the

country, stopping manufacturing pursuits, but because they *immediately met with a sympathizing body of thousands and tens of thousands of people who had no employment at all?* It is this fact which adds most to the alarming nature of the riots, and which impresses us with the most gloomy anticipations for the future. Our only hope is in the continued exertions of the League, aided by the prayers and the zealous co-operation of the pious ministers of the gospel who have already so nobly exerted themselves in favour of the people's rights. Our cause is based upon truth, and the arguments in its favour have only to become generally known to ensure its entire triumph. Agitation has already accomplished much, and it must and will accomplish more. We are glad to perceive, from Mr. Cobden's speech, that it is the intention of the League to carry the war into the enemy's quarters. Lecturers will visit the agricultural districts, and three prizes have been offered for the 'best practical essays, demonstrating the injurious effects of the Corn Law on tenant farmers and farm labourers, and the advantages which those classes would derive from its total and immediate repeal.' These essays, when published, will, no doubt, be extensively distributed amongst the classes whose interests they will discuss. The prizes are not large, but it is to be hoped that the excellence of the design will induce men of talent to write for them. The essays are to be sent to the League not later than the first of November.

We cannot close this article without again urging upon our readers the necessity of renewed exertion. Every day adds to the solemn responsibility of every man who can aid, in any way, the diffusion of free-trade principles. Let our friends in the agricultural districts be prepared to second the efforts of the League in teaching the farmers and their labourers that the repeal of the Corn Laws would benefit them, and that 'protection to agriculture' is only another name for protection to *Rent*. 'Let us do our duty, gentlemen,' exclaimed Mr. Cobden, 'one six months longer; let us exert ourselves with tenfold energy; and call upon the people to unite, as they will unite with us; and I engage that when parliament meets again, the prime minister will not dare to face us without bringing in a Corn Bill, such as he believes will demolish the agitation about the Corn Laws.'

Brief Notices.

The Seasons. By James Thomson. With engraved Illustrations from Designs on Wood, and with the Life of the Author, by Patrick Murdock, D.D., F.R.S. Edited by Bolton Corney, Esq. London: Longman.

NEVER did poet appear in more beautiful and appropriate attire than Thomson does in the volume before us. It realizes all which his warmest admirers can desire, and leaves far behind every competitor for public favour. 'In their endeavour to produce a beautifully illustrated edition of *Thomson's Seasons*, it has been the object of the publishers to combine the attractions of a faithful text with the best specimens of the graphic art.' Such was the announcement which preceded the appearance of the work, and it is bare justice to add, that the expectations awakened by it have been fully met. It has rarely been our lot to examine a volume of such exquisite beauty,—one which realizes so thoroughly our conception of what is due, in this age of refinement, to departed genius. The poem is printed from the edition of 1746, which contains the final revision of the author, who died two years afterwards. This edition has been strangely overlooked by Thomson's biographers, and numerous errors have consequently crept into subsequent reprints of his work. This is the more surprising, as several Lives of the Poet have been published, some of them by persons of considerable eminence in the republic of literature. Dr. Murdoch, whose memoir, from the revised edition of 1768, is prefixed to the volume, was an intimate friend of Thomson, and his narrative is enriched by the present editor with a large collection of notes drawn from the labour of other biographers.

The illustrations, seventy-seven in number, are from designs by various members of the etching club, and afford gratifying proof of the eminence which English artists may hope to gain in this hitherto neglected branch of their profession. Of the designs generally, it may with truth be affirmed, in the language of the editor, that 'the artists have established their relationship to the poet: they have evinced a similar intimacy with the forms and phases of nature, and a capability of giving each idea its apt expression.' Materials are, of course, furnished for minute criticism, but the general execution is so admirable, that we feel greatly disinclined to point out exceptions. An ambitious tendency is occasionally apparent, and a violation of anatomical propriety is observable in some of the figures. These, however, are minute defects which a severer taste and more accurate perception will easily rectify.

The whole work is beautifully brought out, and Mr. Corney's labours as editor have kept pace with those of the artists, in leaving us nothing to desire on behalf of a work than which few possess more numerous or warmer admirers.

Annotations on the Pentateuch, or the Five Books of Moses, the Psalms of David, and the Song of Solomon. By Henry Ainsworth. Parts I.—V. Glasgow: Blackie and Son.

Ainsworth's *Annotations* enjoy an European reputation, and are eminently distinguished by a thorough knowledge of Jewish learning, and a profound insight into the meaning and spirit of the inspired records. It is one of the best books which the industry and learning of our puritan fathers have bequeathed us, and is not supplanted by anything which has appeared since their day. It should be found in every theological library, and will prove an invaluable companion and aid to the rising ministry. That such a work should not have been reprinted in this country since 1639, is matter of great astonishment, and reflects no credit on our biblical reputation. It is emphatically, in the words of the present publishers, 'A work which has been praised by all of every denomination who have had access to consult its valuable pages; a work combining a thorough knowledge and explanation of the original Hebrew, with a most indefatigable comparison of the Old and New Testament Dispensations, illustrating Scripture by Scripture, and admitting nothing that is fanciful, or founded on mere conjecture, but establishing the true meaning of the passages explained by a patient investigation of the sense of the various places in the sacred oracles where the subjects are treated; a work suited to enrich the mind, to facilitate an understanding of the divine records, and to repay the diligent research of the most learned, whilst it is calculated to excite in all an earnest desire to be better acquainted with these copious streams of divine instruction.'

The edition now before us is to consist of thirteen parts, price two shillings each, of which five have already reached us, and it is needless to say that its success has our warmest wishes. We strongly recommend it to theological readers at large, and to our younger ministers especially.

The Pictorial Edition of Shakspeare. William Shakspeare. A Biography. Nos. I.—III. London: Charles Knight.

A biography of William Shakspeare from one of his most laborious and discriminating editors, whose reverence is shown in the efforts made to secure the great dramatist an opportunity of speaking after his own fashion, and not in the artificial style imposed by modern criticism, cannot fail to be a great acquisition. Mr. Knight possesses, in an uncommon degree, the qualities required for such an undertaking. He is an indefatigable collector of local traditions, a keen detector of those minuter points, both of history and character, which constitute the materials for such a biography as that of William Shakspeare; patient in research, large and comprehensive in the spirit of his criticism, of sound judgment, and an intense though not blind admiration of the genius of his hero. With such qualifications he has diligently devoted

himself to the examination of all the materials which are in existence, and the success of his labours is clearly shown in the numbers now before us. His views are clearly stated in a postscript to the sixth volume of the present edition, in which he informs us that he contemplates 'an extended view of *Shakspeare in connexion with his age*, its literature, its politics, its religion.' 'I would regard him,' says Mr. Knight, 'in association with the courtiers and the men of letters of the days of Elizabeth and James; I would surround him with all the customs and manners of his times; I would exhibit him amongst the scenes in which he lived in his boyhood, his maturity, and his later years. I profess to have no new materials for such a life, but I may be able to make the old materials more attractive than they have yet been made.'

A biography conceived in such a spirit, and executed with Mr. Knight's acknowledged ability, cannot fail to receive a hearty welcome from all the admirers of one of the loftiest geniuses which has ever adorned our nature.

England in the Nineteenth Century. Northern Division—Lancashire.
Part VIII. London: How and Parsons.

This part completes the county of Lancashire, which may now be had in a separate volume, and which will be found to be as valuable in its details, as it is beautiful and varied in its illustrative engravings. The cotton manufactures of the county, its local traditions and historical features, the habits of its people, and the architectural remains of a former age which adorn its surface, are described with a fulness and accuracy which entitle the work to general patronage. This *Illustrated Itinerary*, if completed in the spirit and style in which it has been commenced, will constitute one of the most valuable publications of our day.

Tracts on the Errors and Evils of the Church of England. By the
Rev. W. Thorn. London: Jackson and Walford.

Mr. Thorn is doing good service by the publication of these tracts, which, we are glad to find, are obtaining extensive circulation through the country. They are brief, consisting only of four pages each, are written in a perspicuous, pungent, and popular style, and display an extensive acquaintance with the genius and working of our state church. Such publications, issued at the low price of one halfpenny each, are admirably suited to the wants of the present day, and should be distributed freely in every parish of the empire. They will find their way where more bulky and elaborate treatises never appear, and cannot fail to make a strong impression. The following titles of the tracts constituting the Set now before us, which may be purchased for one shilling, sufficiently indicate their nature and the wide range which the author has taken:—'1. The Essential Difference between the Church of

Christ and the Church of England. 2. The Popery of the Church of England. 3. The Superstitious Rites and Notions of the Church of England. 4. The Glaring Inconsistencies of the Evangelical Clergy. 5. The Indecency of the Marriage Service of the Church of England. 6. Dissent not Sinful, and Justified by the Example of the Church of England. 7. The Sin and Danger of Conformity to the Church of England. 8. The Real Churchman's Complaint against the Holy Scriptures. 9. Distressing and wicked falsehoods taught by the Clergy of the Church of England. 10. The Sin of teaching Children the Church Catechism. 11. The extravagant Claims of the National Clergy. 12. The Soul-deceiving Burial Service of the Church of England. 13. The Church of England expensive and ruinous to the Poor. 14. The Church of England supported by anti-Christian and iniquitous Taxation. 15. Church Patronage; or, Trading in the Souls of Men. 16. Enlightened Conformists doing evil that good may come. 17. The Evils of training up the Young in the Church of England. 18. Why Conformists prefer the Church to the Chapel. 19. Why Dissenters prefer the Chapel to the Church. 20. The National Church a Creature and Vassal of the State. 21. The Ungodly Baptismal Service of the Church of England. 22. The Church of England a discordant and schismatical Sect. 23. The Church of England an inequitable and persecuting Sect. 24. The Church of England a signal and miserable failure.'

We specially recommend Nos. 5, 10, 12, and 21, for immediate perusal.

Canadian Scenery Illustrated. From drawings by W. H. Bartlett, engraved in the first style of the art. The Literary department by N. P. Willis, Esq. Part XXV. London: George Virtue.

The Scenery and Antiquities of Ireland, &c. Part XVI. London: George Virtue.

The early reputation of these works is well sustained by the parts recently issued. The engravings are of a very superior order, combining much artistical skill, with a suggestive power rarely surpassed, while the literary department familiarizes the reader with the history, habits, and traditions of countries fraught with interest to every intelligent Englishman. A more happy combination of art and literature is rarely witnessed, and the volumes will, in consequence, be equally appropriate to the drawing-room and the library.

Madagascar and its Martyrs. London: Snow.

Missionary Stories. London: Snow.

The first of these publications, though designed for the young, may be read with advantage and pleasure by persons of all ages. It is compiled from several larger works, and relates one of the most interesting narratives of Christian fortitude which modern times have witnessed. It contains five engravings, and is sold for eightpence.

The other little publication, entitled, *Missionary Stories*, sold at one halfpenny each, is admirably adapted to promote a missionary spirit amongst the youngest readers, and thus to prepare them for taking their part in that good service to which the church is now called. Parents and teachers would do well to place it in the hands of their young charge.

Le Keux's Memorials of Cambridge: A Series of Views of the Colleges, Halls, &c., of the University and Town of Cambridge. Engraved by J. Le Keux, with Historical and Descriptive Accounts of the Buildings, by Thomas Wright, Esq., M.A., F.S.A., and the Rev. H. L. Jones, M.A., F.S.A. Parts XXXIII., XXXIV. London: Tilt and Bogue.

This beautiful work is now approaching to its completion, and cannot fail to be highly acceptable to a large class. No Cambridge man will deem his library complete without it; and others who are interested in the history and resources of the University, will, of necessity, avail themselves of the information it supplies. No. XXXIII. completes the parishes of St. Giles, St. Peter, and St. Clement, and No. XXXIV. is devoted to Magdalene College.

A Family Record; or, Memoirs of the late Rev. Basil Woodd, M.A., Rector of Drayton Beauchamp, Bucks, and Minister of Bentinck Chapel, St. Mary-le-bone, and of several deceased members of his family. A new edition revised, with an Appendix.

The late Rev. Basil Woodd was one of the school of Newton, Cecil, and Venn—a school that has now become obsolete. They were the best and the most useful clergymen of the last century. They fanned the flame of evangelical religion in the established church, which had been kindled by the labours of Whitfield and the Wesleys. This family record is a beautiful exhibition of practical Christianity, as it forms the character, regulates the conduct, soothes the heart, and sustains and animates the Christian, amidst all the vicissitudes of life and death. The memoirs, except his own, were written by this excellent servant of Christ, and will amply repay a serious perusal. The account of Mr. Basil Woodd is drawn up with simplicity, and is an elegant tribute to departed worth, a grateful embalming of the memory of one whose name is pronounced even now, by some with love, and by many with veneration.

We have a glimpse of the character of Mr. Woodd as a Christian and a minister, in the last sentences he entered in his journal a short time before his death.

‘I have aimed at promoting the knowledge and love of the truth as it is in Jesus, in the church, and in the world at large. Oh that I had more and more simply and efficiently! I am ashamed, humbled, on account of all. But oh! had I all the faith of Abraham, the zeal of

St. Paul, the ardour of St. Peter, the meekness of Moses, I would look above all these excellent graces for my acceptance with God. No merit but that of my beloved Saviour,—with the mantle of his obedience unto death may I be covered. May I be found in him, accounted righteous before God only for the merit of my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Here I can rest through faith, and find it full of consolation. Glory be to God for such a hope within the veil.'

With one more extract, which we think justly describes the character of Mr. Basil Woodd, we conclude this brief notice:—

'The most prominent characteristics of our deceased friend were, a mind deeply and powerfully impressed with the truth and importance of the religion he inculcated; a peculiar sweetness of natural temper, heightened and improved by the careful cultivation of the Christian graces; an uniform exercise of the most endearing courtesy and kindness; a steady, undeviating adherence in his public teaching to the simple doctrines of the gospel, without any affectation of novelty, or attempt to fathom or explain its deeper mysteries; a style of address well calculated to make its way to the consciences of his hearers, and which, while chaste and free from everything that could give just offence to the most fastidious ear, was equally adapted to the most ordinary capacity; an assiduous attention to the more private duties of catechising youth, distributing Bibles and religious tracts, visiting the sick, relieving the distressed, counselling, admonishing, exhorting, as opportunities offered, and circumstances dictated; in a word, an unweaned perseverance in well doing, under whatever discouragements or difficulties.' Though no translator of *Æschylus*, he was one of the church of England's brightest ornaments.

Dr. Pusey answered, in a Letter addressed to his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, in which the chief errors of the new system are exposed, and the prevailing tendency to Romanism traced to its causes. By the Rev. William Atwell, A.M., Trinity College, Dublin, and Curate of St. Mark's Parish. London: Seeleys, Hatchard, and Nisbet.

If the spread of Romanism has anything in it to alarm the ecclesiastical head of England's protestant episcopal church, this pamphlet cannot fail greatly to affect the nerves of the most reverend prelate to whom it is addressed. Popery proper is on the increase; disguised popery is making very rapid strides among the rising clergy. The leaven is working mightily. Travel where you will by public vehicles, sojourn where you may, at hotels, boarding-houses, and places of general accommodation, you are sure to be brought into contact with a parson, and that parson, in nine cases out of ten, is sure to be a Puseyite. We doubt not but that these two poperies are both the cause and the effect of each other. Romanism has produced Puseyism, and Puseyism is again supplying daily new converts to Romanism. But it may be asked, and the question ought to be pressed home to the

rulers of the episcopacy,—How is it that the church of England is the only protestant church in the world that openly avows her antagonism to Rome, and is yet perpetually breeding papists in her own bosom, and affording popery its best facilities for propagating and extending its heresies and delusions? There must be something rotten in the state of Denmark,—men who well understand the nature of this spiritual malady in the state church, tell us that this rottenness is at the core. For our own part, we know not how a consistent churchman can meet a Puseyite in the field of argument, and we are perfectly sure that a Puseyite has no chance with a Romanist.

Our readers will be greatly amused, as we were, with Mr. Atwell's simplicity, when he says to the Archbishop of Canterbury (we wonder whether archbishops ever laugh in their sleeves), 'In its scriptural character, our church, as now established, has the impress of truth upon it; and, regardless how it has arrived at this happy consummation, let us, as dutiful children, render obedience to our kind and indulgent mother, who in infancy cherished us in her bosom, in youth nourished us with the sincere milk of the word, and in manhood fed us with the bread of heaven.' We have been looking in vain for an opportunity to take a peep at this kind and indulgent old lady; indeed, we have often asked some of her sons, so eloquent in her praise, to favour us with an introduction to her, but we could never catch them 'in the vein.' We have sometimes imagined that the personage we have seen rolling in pomp and splendour from the palace to the cathedral, and from the cathedral to the palace, must be the very old gentlewoman in question; but we have been mortified to learn, that we have mistaken the right reverend Father for the never-to-be-too-highly revered mother; though we could never obtain a glimpse of the great impalpable invisibility, we have been told to open our ears and we should hear her. 'Hear the church.' We listen,—Bishop Blomfield is preaching and propounding tenets that savour very strongly of Rome; another voice is raised, (for her ancient ladyship seems to be an accomplished ventriloquist): Bishop Bagot is delivering a charge to his clergy,—that, too, is a shield thrown over the restorers of Romanism in the Anglican establishment. A third voice, more tremulous than the last, gives forth no uncertain sound—it is that of his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury maintaining apostolical succession, sacerdotal authority, the efficacy of sacraments, and the exclusive possession by the clergy of a power to open and shut at their pleasure the door of the kingdom of heaven. We have no wish to hear the church any further, and we leave her nurslings in her bosom. The next generation are likely to turn out a very pretty brood,—infant Bonners, Parkers, and Whitgifts; they already lisp the language of intolerance; and if the nation look not to it, the sword of persecution will be ready to their hands by the time they will be able to use it. That time, we confidently believe, will never come,—

—'that two-handed engine at the door,
Stands ready to smite once, and smite no more.'

LYCIDAS.

Brief Memorials of the Rev. B. W. Mathias, late Chaplain of Bethesda Chapel, Dublin. London: Longman, Brown, and Co.

Mr. Mathias was a pupil of that singular man, the Rev. John Walker, who was at the time, and long afterwards, purely evangelical in his sentiments, and an exemplary clergyman of the church of Ireland. The subject of these brief memorials derived the greatest advantage from Mr. Walker's friendship, till the strange opinions which his tutor afterwards adopted, prevented them from holding the Christian intercourse they had formerly enjoyed. Mr. Mathias was the great instrument of the revival of religion in the Irish church. He infused into it the missionary spirit, established Sunday schools, and was the first to welcome the Bible Society, and to give it in Dublin a local habitation and a name. Most catholic in his intercourse with Christians of all denominations, he braved the charge of irregularity by preaching in the unconsecrated pulpits of men who pretended not to be the successors of the apostles. All loved him, except the bigots of his own communion. His memory is blessed, and these 'brief memorials' will be read by many with affectionate delight.

Memoir of the Rev. Robert Findlater, late minister of the chapel of Erse, Inverness; together with a Narrative of the Revival of Religion during his ministry at Lochtayside, Perthshire, in 1816—1819. To which are prefixed, Memoirs of his Parents. By the Rev. William Findlater. London: Whittaker and Co.

Besides an affectionate tribute to near and dear relations eminently useful in life, and now passed into eternity, this unpretending volume contains much of devout sentiment, and many profitable observations on religion in general, and especially on revivals, as they are called, which have at distant intervals been so remarkable in Scotland. The work requires no recommendation of ours. It is, we doubt not, a welcome companion in many pious families north of the Tweed; and we should be glad to see it travelling southward.

The Eucharist not an ordinance of the Christian church; being an attempt to prove that eating bread and drinking wine in commemoration of Jesus Christ is not obligatory upon Christians. By Joseph Goodman. London: Sherwood.

"Prove all things, and hold fast that which is good;" in obedience to this apostolic command, we feel ourselves still bound to the administration of the Lord's Supper as a memorial of his sacrificial death, notwithstanding all the arguments of Mr. Goodman to persuade us to change our opinions and to abandon our practice. He has cleared away some rubbish, and has written in a commendable spirit. We question whether he will be able to get up a controversy on the subject. No sacrament at all is infinitely to be preferred to the *opus operatum* of the Anglican and Roman churches. But let us hear the truth; it lies between the extremes. *In medio tutissimus ibis.*

THE LADY'S CLOSET LIBRARY :—*The Hannahs: or, Maternal Influence on Sons.* By Robert Philip, author of "The Marys," "Marthas," "Lydias," &c., &c. London: Virtue.

What a progeny is here—Marys, Marthas, Lydias,—and now the Hannahs! Mr. Philip is no mere compiler. He has a mind of his own—and it is opulent to overflowing. He has also a rich fancy, and all he writes is baptized with the spirit of piety. But who is perfect? His style often violates the proprieties of taste; he knows it, but still goes on in his trespasses. The volume before us has, indeed, fewer of the blemishes with which his other works abound; which leads us to hope that he is not incorrigible. The first chapter, on "The Peculiarities of Christianity towards Mothers," is a superior performance, and is managed with considerable ingenuity. The work as a whole scarcely answers to the title; we see Hannah in one chapter only, and the Hannahs might have been the Sarahs, or the Rebeccas, or the Elizabeths; but we suppose we shall be presented with them in due form on some special and pertinent occasion. We are well pleased with the happy blending of the sprightly and the serious in this elegant addition to the Lady's Closet Library, while we were a little surprised that the childless Queen Dowager should have the work inscribed to her as especially "revered and beloved by British mothers." Is she not as much an object of regard to British sisters and British widows, as to British mothers?

A Memoir of the late Mrs. Sarah Budgett, of Kingswood Hill, Bristol; including Extracts from her Letters and Journals. By John Gas-kin, A.M., incumbent of Holy Trinity Church, Kingswood Hill, Bristol. London: Simpkin and Marshall.

We are certainly of opinion that this memoir of a true Christian, a member of the Wesleyan church, ought to be read by all Christians of a catholic spirit. We wish that Methodism, and such liberal piety as that which glowed in Mrs. Budgett's bosom, were indeed one and indivisible.

Literary Intelligence.

In the Press.

Early in October will be published, *The Conciliator of R. Manasseh Ben Israel; A Reconciliation of the Apparent Contradictions in Holy Scripture*, to which are added Explanatory Notes and Biographical Notices of the quoted Authorities. By E. H. Lindo, Author of the Jewish Calendar.

Just Published.

The Pictorial History of England during the Reign of George the Third, being a History of the People as well as of the Kingdom. Illustrated with several hundred Wood-cuts, by George L. Craik and Charles M'Farlane, &c. Vols. I. and II.

Torrent of Portugal. An English Metrical Romance, now first published from an unique MS. of the Fifteenth Century, preserved in the Chetham Library at Manchester. Edited by J. O. Halliwell, Esq., F.R.S., &c.

A Review of the Bishop of London's Three Sermons on the Church. By John H. Hinton, M.A.

The Unity of the Christian Church, and the Communion of Christians. A Discourse by W. L. Alexander, M.A., to which are prefixed, Strictures on an Address to Dissenters, recently issued by the Scotch Central Board for vindicating the rights of Dissenters.

Elements of Latin Hexameters and Pentameters. By Rev. Robert Bland. Sixteenth Edition, revised.

The Rudiments of Greek Grammar as used in the College at Eton. Edited by Rev. J. Bosworth, D.D., F.R.S. Fourth Edition.

Nine Letters on the Corn Laws, originally published in the 'Morning Chronicle,' 'The Sun,' &c. &c. Corrected and revised.

Brief Memorials of Departed Saints, designed to exhibit the animating and supporting influence of Christianity in Labours, Sufferings, and Death. By the late Rev. J. M. Chapman (of Yeovil), with a brief Memoir of the Author, by Rev. J. Baynes.

Doctor Hookwell, or the Anglo-Catholic Family. 3 vols.

What will this Babbler say? By the Rev. W. Pym, M.A., Vicar of Willian, Herts.

The Seven Churches of Asia. By Rev. J. A. Wallace, of Hawick.

Elements of Geometry, consisting of the first four, and the sixth books of Euclid, chiefly from the text of Dr. Robert Simson, with the principal Theorems in Proportion, and a Course of Practical Geometry on the Ground, &c. &c. By John Narrien, F.R.S. and R.A.S., Professor of Mathematics at Sandhurst.

The Comedies, Histories, Tragedies, and Poems of William Shakspeare. Edited by Charles Knight. Second Edition. Vol. V.

Lectures on Female Prostitution: its nature, extent, effects, guilt, causes, and remedy. By Ralph Wardlaw, D.D. Delivered and published by special request.

Produce your Authority! or the Proper Mode of dealing with ecclesiastical assumptions. By Edward Miall. Second Thousand.

Russia and the Russians in 1842. By J. G. Kohl, Esq. Vol. I.

Newfoundland in 1842; a sequel to 'The Canadas in 1841.' By Sir Richard Henry Bonnycastle, Knt., Lt.-Col., R.E. 2 vols.

Norway and her Laplanders in 1841, with Hints to the Salmon Fisher. By John Milford, of St. John's College, Cambridge.

Exercises, Political and others. By Lieut.-Col. T. Perronet Thompson. 6 vols. 12mo.

National Warnings; a Sermon on behalf of the Distressed Manufacturers. By John Blackburn.

Essays on the Principles of Morality, and on the Rights and Obligations of Mankind. By Jonathan Dymond. Fourth Edition.

The Anatomy of Sleep; or, the Art of Procuring Slumber at Will. By Dr. Binns, M.D.

The Biblical Cabinet. Calvin and Storr on the Epistles to the Philippians and Colossians.

A Manual of Devotion for Individuals, &c. By an Octogenarian.

Phonography; or, Universal Writing of Speech and Music. By V. D. De Stains, Graduate of the University of Paris. Second Edition, greatly augmented, with Plates. 8vo.

Oxford Unmasked; or, an Attempt to Describe some of the Abuses in that University. By a Graduate.

Poems. By Thomas Powell. 1 vol. Foolscap.

Principles of Money; with their Application to the Reform of the Currency and of Banking, and the Relief of Financial Difficulties. By John Wade.